Meeting Minutes

Collaborative Forest Restoration Program
Technical Advisory Panel Meeting
April 25-29, 2011

Hyatt Place Albuquerque/Uptown,
6901 Arvada Avenue, NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico

/S/ Walter W. Dunn **6/16/2011**
Walter W. Dunn **Date**
Chairman and Assistant Designated Federal Officer

Contents

Contents ..... **i**

April 25, 2011 ..... **3**
Welcome and Introductions - Walter Dunn 3

April 26, 2011 ..... **53**
Review Agenda 53
Review of Applications 54

April 27, 2011 ..... **113**
Review Agenda for the Day 113

April 28, 2011 ..... **177**
Review Agenda for the Day 177
Review Applications 177

April 29, 2011 ..... **227**
Review Agenda for the Day 227

Feedback on 2011 RFA **254**
Review 2011 Request for Applications to identify areas for improvement 254

April 25, 2011

Welcome and Introductions - Walter Dunn

Mr. Dunn welcomed everyone to the meeting. He expressed his appreciation for all the hours of work that had gone into preparing for the meeting. He explained there was a significantly revised review process for proposal review in response to comments from last year's panel. This review would also be different because of lively debates regarding the federal budget, so he couldn't say how much or even if there would be money to provide this year. He hoped to have a number for the amount of funding available by the end of May or first week in June.

He explained another difference in the process. This year, the panel's recommendations would be ranked among each category, rather than creating a list of the appropriated dollars, since they didn't know what kind of funding they would have.

Introductions

Mr. Dunn introduced himself and gave his background. Then the Panelists introduced themselves. Staff members Mr. Payne and Alicia San Gill introduced themselves.

Mr. Dunn noted that Mr. Jervis actually testified before the Senate on the Forest Restoration Act when it was considered. He was on the panel 3 years ago.

Agenda

Meeting Logistics – The Facilitator Romero, Facilitator

Review Of Purposes, Desired Outcomes And Agenda – The Facilitator Rosemary Romero

Mr. Dunn read the purpose, desired outcomes and agenda. The purpose was to use a consensus- based process to develop recommendations for the Forest Service Southwestern Regional Forester, regarding which grant applications best meet the objectives of the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program. Second, to create an environment in which interest groups that have a stake in the management of public forest land in New Mexico can build an agreement on how forest restoration should occur on those lands. He said they hoped to have the Desired Outcomes in hand by Friday, April 24. The first was a report from the federal advisory committee, which would be posted on their website and presented to the Regional Forester. It would include strengths, weaknesses, and recommended funding levels for each 2011 CFRP grant application. The second outcome would be a set of scores for each application indicating the degree to which it met the CFRP evaluation criteria. Third was on recommendations for approving the individual grant applications, where appropriate. Next was on the recommendations for approving the CFRP request for applications, and application review process, which would be particularly important. Last, the task for the CFRP subcommittee was to review the CFRP multi-party assessment reports, which was scheduled for September.

Presentation: CFRP Accomplishments – Walter Dunn

Mr. Dunn said they would begin with a short presentation from Ms. San Gill regarding CFRP accomplishments to date. They would then talk about what it meant to be a Federal Advisory Committee. After, they would review Federal by-laws. After lunch, they would review the application evaluation process, which had been significantly revised that year. Then they would begin the evaluation process. He noted that there were 33 proposals to view, and that two proposals had been withdrawn by the applicants.

Mr. Dunn said the amount of time the panel put into reviewing the proposals astounded him. He said it was a grueling process, and a great example of true civic engagement. He said it was a lot of volunteer time that had been put in, and the panel members were engaged in good governance. There was applause for the panel members' hard work.

Mr. Payne announced that there would be a get-together the following night at his home. He asked who would be attending, so his wife could prepare.

Mr. Dunn said his presentation was basically the same one he had given at the annual CFRP workshop. He asked people there to give him any advice on how to improve his presentation, since he traveled around and gave it a lot. He said there was an increased interest around the country from around the country regarding what they did at the CFRP. There were some people who had asked for permission to borrow both the presentation and the CFRP display for their own events.

Mr. Dunn showed a picture of the Chimayó Conservation Core thinning Ponderosa Pine on the Truchas Land Grant, which was part of a CFRP grant. He said there were three objectives for the presentation: what the CFRP did; what the CFRP had accomplished; where the CFRP was going. The Core Purposes were improving communication and joint problem solving, encourage sustainable communities and sustainable forest. Including a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders in project design implementation and monitoring. He focused on these objectives because he thought they made CFRP what it was, and made it unique or different from other programs.

Mr. Dunn said there were two sides to their program. One involved sustainable forests, including wildlife and ecosystem restoration, reforestation, etc. The other side involved community sustainability, including forest-related employment and diverse and balanced groups of stakeholders. Both sides fell under developing, demonstrating, and evaluating ecologically sound forest restoration techniques. Historically, the CFRP competitive grant funding history showed that, since 2001, they had received 352 proposals, not including the current batch. Of the 352, 144 projects had been funded. There was an average of 35 proposals submitted per year. They averaged 41% funding for applicants, which he thought was fairly high.

Since 2001, there had been $52.9 million invested in New Mexico, $42.3 million was Federal, $10.6 million was matched and in-kind funding. The projects covered twenty out of 33 different counties in New Mexico, and were distributed quite widely throughout the forested communities. The tenure of CFRP treatments, or the land ownership where the projects had been implemented were: 38% on Forest Service, 13% on Tribal, 11% were on land mixed among the various owners, 5% on State, 4% on local (municipal or county), 3% are BLM/Bureau of Reclamation, 26% fell under the category N/A (feasibility studies, biomass, etc.).

Mr. Dunn then discussed the recipients of the grants. Of 144 projects, there had been 99 recipients, as some recipients had received more than one CFRP grant. 30% had gone to NGO (Non-Government Organizations), 30% had gone to private businesses, 22% had gone to Tribes, 7% had gone to the State, 6% had gone to schools, and 6% had gone to local governments. He noted that CFRP proposals did much more than treating acreage, and thought the current year's proposals reflected that. He said they had completed 23,700 acres, which was about 80% of the anticipated acres. When looking at the 23,700 acres that had been completed, 44% had been mixed Conifer/Ponderosa, 31% had been Piñon, Pine, and Juniper, and 25% had been Bosque or Riparian. They expected to treat almost 30,000 acres total.

Mr. Dunn pointed out that they had done much more than treat acreage. The invested federal monies had also gone to things like planning, training, and infrastructure development.

Mr. Dunn talked about the increased focus on Forest Watershed Restoration. CFRP was extremely well positioned to make significant contributions along those lines. He showed several examples of projects which were funded by CFRP grants. He noted that training and forest-related employment had created 590 jobs. He also noted that youth involvement over the years had greatly increased: over 90% of the grants now involved youth. He said the project was originally designed in a “youth corps” kind of model, which had evolved into the idea that the youth should help with the data collection and monitoring. Some of the youth were becoming young professionals who were working for the Forest Service or for Tribes due to their involvement in CFRP programs. He noted that the CFRP programs also helped youth to become reconnected with their traditional landscape and heritage, especially for tribal youth.

Mr. Dunn said he had often stressed the importance of technical assistance not only for applicants during the application process, but also for grant recipients as they develop their multi-party monitoring plans. This technical assistance led to the development of the core ecological indicators, and he hoped to develop within the year the core socio-economic indicators. This would allow them the aggregation of results across projects, so that they could see what they had accomplished at a larger scale. He didn’t think the aggregation of the results had not been originally considered, but rather it was more an idea for individual grass-roots projects with adaptive management technique. As the project had evolved, the grantees wanted to know what the bigger story was. To do that, the CFRP needed to come up with core factors to measure, which would allow for comparison across the different projects.

Mr. Dunn showed another example of how some grant monies had been used to purchase saw mill equipment to transport wood chips and sawdust, to contribute to the full utilization of mill by-products. He explained how CFRP had impacted the mill, and how their funds had helped to reopen it. He showed another example of some equipment purchased with another CFP grant.

Mr. Dunn said, when looking at the idea of involving diverse and balanced stakeholders, there were 458 partners (participants) as stakeholders in the CFRP over the years. He discussed how the numbers had risen over the years. He also discussed the trends in the planning projects, which had increased over the years. In order to truly have a collaborative forest restoration program, panel members in years past had realized that planning projects had to be done as collaboratively as the entire project. Now, they had CFRP projects being implemented in which the actual NEPA and planning process was also funded by CFRP, especially when the planning process was not something that could have been done by the Forest Service (i.e. working across tribes, land grants, BLM, and various different land ownerships, etc.).

According to the presentation, planning as a percentage of the total projects was 36% the previous year. Mr. Dunn explained that for the current year, they had separated out the evaluation of the planning proposals from the direct implementation proposals, and from the utilization projects. That way the panel members would not be comparing different types of proposals to one another. That way they would be comparing planning proposals only to other planning proposals, and utilization proposals only to other utilization proposals.

Mr. Dunn said another area the CFRP had moved into within the last couple of years was restoration strategies and payment services in the Ruidoso Watershed, in light of the flood a few years prior. The project had attracted a lot of attention nationally. The project that had laid the ground for the Ruidoso project was the Santa Fe Watershed project, which he described. He also discussed the positive reception that the Ruidoso Watershed project received. He said the area of ecosystem services was a lively subject nationally, and that what was being done locally was cutting edge.

Mr. Dunn said another element of the CFRP that made it different than many other kinds of projects was the requirement that each project must include a multi-party assessment upon project completion regarding the degree to which they met their objectives. He showed images from another watershed improvement project. At the program level, he said they were monitoring to see what the cumulative accomplishments or adverse impacts might be. He said the idea of how to evaluate the big picture of what had been accomplished was a continual challenge.

Mr. Dunn said one of the things he intended to focus his energy on in the next year was what to do after collecting all the information, and putting it into a feedback loop. He said whether it was ecological or economic, the information should be fed back into not only adaptive management of an existing project, but in the creation of new projects, so that they could be based on what had been learned in the past. At the subcommittee meeting in September they would deal with that issue. He invited people to come. The idea at the meeting would be to review completed multiparty assessment reports to see what they meant. He explained that this was part of why the subcommittee had originally been created. He said he was trying to create feedback so that the monitoring was not done for nothing.

Mr. Dunn then shared the 2010 core indicators. He said he was currently working with a number of entities to try to develop a similar short list of socio-economic and Bosque restoration indicators that would act as a framework that all CFRP applicants would be required to use. He pointed out the indicators would not preclude the applicants from including other core indicators specific to their projects. It would also be something he would be asking the subcommittee to look at in September.

Mr. Dunn showed a selection of 20 projects had been chosen in 2010 for long term (15 year) ecological monitoring. He explained that the long term monitoring was different than the multiparty monitoring. He said it meant that they looked at the projects that were doing work on the ground to see what kind of long term impact they had. The way they had decided to do it was to create a “sample” of the projects that are across ecological/forest types, as well as a variety of projects in a variety of geographical areas. One of the things they had encountered was that the group that was going out and doing the monitor would go out and the land owner would say it was not in the original grant agreement. This year, he hoped to modify the grant award letter to indicate that they could be monitored for the next 15 years.

Mr. Dunn wanted to talk about what he saw for the future. That year, the secretary of agriculture’s vision for the Forest Service, and the USDA’s strategic plan for 2010-1015 was restoring watershed and forest health. These would be the primary management objective of the Forest Service. He explained that they were focused on watersheds because they are universal, well-defined areas that provide a common basis for discussion of water-related resources and landscapes. He thought that language really complimented the joint problem solving focus of the CFRP. He thought the two ideas had a great opportunity to complement one another. He showed another example of a project.

Mr. Dunn said the Secretary of Agriculture had introduced a watershed condition framework to have a consistent national approach for classifying watershed conditions. He said the agency was to work with states tribes and other parties to identify priority watersheds, and enhance communication and coordination with external agencies and partners. This would enable a coordinated and priority-based approach for allocation of resources to watersheds. He said he felt that CFRP and its project partners and grant recipients had created a real foundation for doing all those things within the state of New Mexico.

Mr. Dunn compared the material for the old paradigm, and the new material that had been developed. In the old paradigm, the highest priority work had done on various individual sites located in a number of different areas’ watersheds. With the new paradigm, suites of projects would be completed on one priority

watershed, and then other projects would be done on the next priority watershed. He discussed some instances where this had happened in the CFRP. He said he thought this policy meant that the agency would need to work in that way more intentionally than had happened in some instances in the past.

Mr. Dunn said in the old paradigm, partnerships had been limited in number and scope. Skills and resources were only somewhat leveraged. Under the new paradigm described by the Secretary of Agriculture, partnerships were an essential part of restoration, where skills and resources were strongly leveraged. He said he saw these aspects of the new paradigm happening in the latest set of applications. He felt that here in New Mexico, they were well- or better-situated to take advantage of the Secretary's direction and show how it could be done.

Mr. Dunn said another part of the Secretary's message was the All Lands Approach Regional Strategy, which was a focus on landscape restoration and watersheds, without being restricted by forest system boundaries. The Secretary wanted to involve collaborative groups in development, compliance monitoring and adaptive future actions based on the monitoring results. He also wanted to expand partnerships and leverage to increase agency capacity for landscape scale work. Mr. Dunn thought the CFRP had been doing both of these things already with partners and non-federal match, and bringing the capacities of entities outside the forest service together to work towards successfully implementing projects that none of the entities could do by themselves.

Mr. Dunn said the Secretary of Agriculture's other goal was to support sustainable, restoration-based economies. He noted that this was language from the Southwest Region's Approach to meeting the Secretary's approach. He said they seemed to him to be very complementary. There were some proposals for this year's review, which he showed to some of the regional directors and pointed out that some of the proposals were almost a perfect match to what the Secretary was asking them to do.

Mr. Dunn talked about "the road ahead" for applicants, and what he saw as opportunities and challenges. They were: including a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders, as well as appropriate federal, tribal, state and county land grant municipal government representatives in the design implementation projects. He said this was out of the RFA request for applications as well as the enabling statute. He wanted to focus on that language because of how well it matched with the goal of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. Dunn said that because of a number of things, including direction from the Secretary of Agriculture, and because agency budgets were unlikely to increase and more likely to decrease, the letter of endorsement from the Land Management Agency would be increasingly important. He said the letter should say the Land Management official collaborated in the development of the proposed project, and would support the implementation of the project, and that the project would complement the Organizations land management objectives.

Mr. Dunn said that in previous years they had evaluation criteria that determined whether the project was identified as a priority in any of a few critical criteria. He noted that according to the watershed condition class exercise, every forest had to have identified five priority watersheds to focus their work, based on the condition class of those watersheds. He anticipated seeing a strength or possibly an evaluation criterion asking if the watershed in question was one of the five priority watersheds, because that's where the forest service is being told that resources should be focused. He said if a project came forward and was in one of those priority areas, it would be much easier for the agency to plan their program of work in a way that could fit a CFRP project into accomplishing those objectives.

Mr. Dunn said the challenges would be coordinating the Forest Service work planning timeline with the CFRP project development and implementation. He emphasized that Forest Service work planning, at the

field level, was being required by the administration to be focused on priority watersheds. He saw CFRP grantees being able to work a year and a half or two years out with the agency, so that there was a common understanding based on the condition class assessments. The degree to which applicants came in two weeks before proposals were due, it would be hard, because less money would be available at those field units to divert people like that.

Mr. Dunn said the bottom line was, in the future, if the CFRP continued to have funding, the successful projects would be those that really were planned a year or more in advance, so that they could harmonize with the scheduling and budgeting, at least for the Forest Service. Another challenge would be the Forest Service's adaptation to the new paradigm described in the All Lands Approach. Implementing long term monitoring and interpreting the results across projects for the purpose of adaptive management would also require a lot of work. He said an ongoing challenge had always been an unstable timber market, and the volatile demand for forest products.

Mr. Dunn talked about what he thought the keys to success were. He said it was important to get involved early in the process of prioritizing watersheds. This was because the Secretary's direction to the agency was quite clear under the watershed condition class exercise as well as the All Lands Approach. The agency was to work collaboratively to identify and prioritize priority areas for work. That direction was more clearly stated than in any other policy direction he had seen. He said that put CFRP grant applicants in a great position to get involved, because CFRP applicants and their partners had a great deal of experience on how to do that. He said he thought it was a great example of democracy: it depended on whoever showed up. He said CFRP applicants and their partners had experience, and were prepared to show up and get involved. He said it would be important for them to get involved in the prioritization process, or it would be hard to find the people and the agencies to get involved in their projects. He said he hoped there would always be an innovative idea that popped up, that no one had ever thought of before, but he thought it was fairly clear where the most traction would be.

Mr. Dunn said it would also be important for applicants to identify the best roles and opportunities for the group. It would be important to go into the meeting with a clear understanding of what that group brought to offer. He gave an example of the Alamo Navajo crew, who was doing restoration work in a variety of places. He said it would also be important for applicants to work with the Forest Service and district staff early in the process to identify and develop CFRP proposals that could be incorporated into the units' future programs of work. He said it was happening much more than it ever used to, as the different forests viewed CFRP as a way to get cross-jurisdictional. He said it allowed the forest service to do things that they would otherwise have been unable to do.

Mr. Payne commented that the five New Mexico Forest Supervisors and a lot of their staff had a meeting with the CFRP discussing exactly what Mr. Dunn was talking about. They discussed how the CFRP could engage their partners to become more effective overall. He said he thought this year's proposals reflected that immensely and he was very impressed and enthusiastic.

Mr. Dunn then showed another picture of some people discussing the outcome of a project. He ended his presentation and asked for questions and comments.

Mr. Cooke asked, since they were looking at projects and grants, if the Forest Service was looking at watersheds on Forest Service properties, were they looking at watersheds inclusive of adjoining properties.

Mr. Dunn asked Carol to answer.

Carol (in audience) said as far as she knew, the watershed condition class work they had been doing only went as far as the forest boundaries. She said the watersheds usually continued further down than the boundaries, but she believed the prioritization they had been doing was only with the National Forest boundaries.

Mr. Racher commented that it said the statewide resource assessment did go across boundaries.

Mr. Dunn pointed out that the All Lands approach described by the Secretary said they should use the condition class information and use that to engage the stakeholders in identifying priority areas to focus resources.

Mr. Cooke said if they were going to use watershed priorities as criteria for selecting projects, etc., would that put projects that might be on a land grant, etc. in a diminutive position for receiving CFRP funding.

Mr. Dunn said his understanding was that the All Lands approach would counteract that.

Mr. Payne said they would also be collaboratively designed.

Mr. Dunn said that in the criteria it asked if the project implemented a CWPP. He said it helped the application if that was a strength. He said he did not think that if the project was not on one of the priority watersheds then they were automatically excluded. He said the case he was trying to make was that he saw that at the field units, their resources and FTEs would be more focused on the watersheds. So if the proposal needed real involvement from a Forest Service field service unit, and it was not related to a prioritized watershed, it would be hard for the Forest Service to partner with it because of limited resources.

Mr. Payne said a lot of the letters this year; the Forest Service said they would commit certain staff members to the projects. He said that was the key that the Forest Service would say that they could only work in certain areas.

Mr. Dunn said that was one thing that he had been speaking to forest supervisors about. As budgets decline, if they don’t have the time, and they had already committed, they would have to say no to such requests for personnel.

Mr. Cooke said what it would mean for the CFRP was that there may be more NEPA processes on things that were not Forest Service priorities.

Mr. Payne said it would depend on where the priority watersheds were.

Mr. Dunn said it was all just prediction, and that it was all new to them. He said those conclusions were just him saying where he thought things were going.

Mr. Olivas asked if the National Forest Management Act that was just coming into play and the Management Plan Rules that were supposedly being updated was all being included in the CFRP process. He asked about the idea behind prioritizing the watersheds.

Mr. Dunn said he was not intimately involved. He said he had been in on a couple of conference calls on the discussions on planning. He said it seemed to him that there was a simple vocabulary in terms of the emphasis on collaboration and on stakeholders. He said the vocabulary of the discussions of the policy leaders in Washington and the watershed people were very similar.

Mr. Olivas said there would be many changes in management plans as they moved forward and was wondering how CFRP would evolve with that change.

Mr. Dunn said that remained to be seen. He said the program, grant applicants, and panel would have to see how they would ride the current. He thought the CFRP program had been on cutting edge in defining these processes. He said he thought they were situated very well at that time. He did not see it as problem but rather as a great opportunity.

Mr. Olivas said he thought the idea was to put in some of those ideas to the Forest supervisors who would be doing those management plans.

Mr. Dunn said that over last year they had seen great interest from Forest Supervisors as to how to incorporate CFRP into their regular work. He said it has been difficult, but welcomed on his part. It was a very dynamic discussion that had never happened in the past.

Mr. Payne said that when they had sat down with Forest Service personnel, they were unsure how to do it, but a number of the applications had done a good job.

What It Means To Be A Federal Advisory Committee

Mr. Dunn said the Federal Advisory Committee Act was part of a group of bills that was commonly referred to as the Sunshine in Government Acts, which were passed originally with the idea, for example, to prevent a bunch of oil executives to sit down with the Secretary of Energy to develop energy policy without any public present.

Mr. Dunn said what that meant for the panel members was that whatever discussions they had were open to anyone who wanted to show up. It also meant that any document that the panel discussed in the advisory committee was available for the public to copy upon request.

Mr. Dunn said he had already made copies of all the documents that he anticipated discussion of. He said they were at the back of the room. He said there was no document available at any time. He also noted that the panel members' names were all on the General Services Administration Federal Advisory Committee act website so anybody who wanted to know who was on the advisory committee could go to GSA and look it up. The report was on the CFRP web site, with a link to the federal web site. The meeting notes were not only on CFRP website but also on the GSA Federal website.

Mr. Dunn explained that the Committee members operate under a charter signed by the Secretary of Agriculture every 2 years. Members only served for two years, but they may reapply, but there was a limit of 6 years of service. To serve on two advisory panels simultaneously, special permission from the Secretary was required. Those were the elements of transparency. The panel members were appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture, whereas in previous years they had been appointed by the Regional Forrester. This particular panel was appointed by the Secretary, so they reported back to the Secretary of Agriculture, but they were acting for the Regional Forrester. The Panel's job was to make recommendations to the Regional forester for what should be funded. He noted that they did not choose what got funded, they only made recommendations.

Mr. Dunn said a large element of this particular advisory committee was conflict of interest, because of New Mexico's small size. Ms. San Gil showed the second on role of panel members as given in the

bylaws. Mr. Dunn reviewed the conflict of interest requirements. He read from the bylaws. If 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 member was directly involved in the development of the proposal, that member shall leave the meeting room during the discussion of that proposal, and recuse themselves from the panel's discussion, to avoid a conflict of interest. Panel members may answer questions from grant applicants regarding the eligibility and appropriateness of the project proposal ideas, and still engage in the discussion and decision on a proposal. Mr. Dunn also noted that it is very important for the recorder to make a note when a member recused themselves and left the room. He noted that The Facilitator had the list of conflicts on various proposals that had been submitted, and was responsible for making sure they left the room when they needed to. He said it had been an issue many times, following panel meetings, when people who had not been recommended for funding had felt they were not being treated fairly because of conflict of interest. He said it was essential for him to be able to refute claims like that with exact information regarding when the panel members left, returned, etc. He said it might sound mundane, but it was very important to maintain. He said they had not yet been to court over the issue but someday might have to.

Mr. Dunn then discussed the other part of the statute. The other statutory direction was that the panel members seek to use a consensus-based process. There had been a variety of levels of consensus by the panel over the years. He thought that the current proposals were of higher quality than he had ever seen, which he thought would make their job a lot harder. One thing he had tried to do, in response to comments the previous year especially, was try to develop a panel review process that focused more on the strengths of the proposals than their weaknesses. In the past, the panel's process may have focused more on weaknesses. He said he had taken lots of time that year to talk with many people who did grant reviews on how to development a process to focus more on strengths.

A question was asked about the process for public comment.

Mr. Dunn noted they had scheduled some time for public comment both before lunch and at the end of the day. The process for public comment, which was described in the federal register announcement for the meeting, indicated that members of the public may address the panel if they had submitted a written comment to Mr. Dunn or Forest Service staff prior to the public comment period. The comment would then be given to the recorder as part of the official minute's record of the meeting. He noted, though, that when the person made their comment, it had to be the same as what was on the statement, and not something else.

The Facilitator suggested that when they start the meeting they remind the public of that fact.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He also noted that some people did not like to speak in public, and he would offer to read their statement for them, since the suggestion had been made. He did say he thought it might be heavy-handed, but he would be willing to do so.

Mr. Bird asked when the members of the public would hand over their comment.

Mr. Dunn said they could do it up to the time when they were to speak. He said it would be better if they could do it earlier, so that they could make copies, etc., but the rule was just that they had to hand it to Mr. Payne, The Facilitator, or Mr. Dunn himself before speaking.

The Facilitator explained that anyone who wanted to make a comment could use their written comment as a kind of "script", but that they needed to stick to what they turned in.

Mr. Dunn gave the process of review: each person who had been assigned an application to present would give a 5 minute summary on the background, objectives, partners and budget of the application. Then the panel would identify and come to agreement on strengths and weaknesses and recommendations for that application. Mr. Dunn encouraged panel members to come up with strengths that were as specific as possible. He said they were not limited to the boilerplate statements on the review sheet. When panel members saw an application from someone who was reapplying, they might be able to sense the frustration of the applicants, as they felt there were no weaknesses. Specificity was crucial, as it was important not only to the applicants, but also to the integrity of the review process. As quality and competitiveness of the proposals increased, the importance of defining why was one better than another in the strengths or describing specific weaknesses became even more important.

Mr. Payne also pointed out that it made it easier to defend the panel's recommendation not to fund a given proposal.

Mr. Dunn said he suspected they had spent a couple hundred hours dealing with applicants who had felt the process was arbitrary, capricious, and inconsistent in terms of defining the strengths and weaknesses.

Ms. San Gil asked which panel members had entered all their scores already (most members raised their hands). She asked who planned to enter more. Mr. Vincent and Mr. Olivas needed to enter more (Mr. Matush and Mr. Racher were out of the room). She said she needed them by the end of the day.

Mr. Dunn said they could only use the scores they had already entered. He said they could not use any un-entered scores when they were calculating the average for the day. He then summarized what he had discussed so far for the application process. He explained they would have some projects for which they had multi-party monitoring reports or upon project completion. He asked if they had any completed multi-party assessment reports, and Ms. San Gil indicated that they did not. Mr. Dunn said there were some projects that included them as part of the application, or in the letter of endorsement.

Mr. Dunn said the last stage was for the panel to review and develop an agreement on the score for each of the evaluation criteria for the application. He said this was the main difference from previous years. He noted that they no longer had categories 1 through 4. Instead, they had a score for each of the thirteen evaluation criteria. He said they would display, on the screen, the average of all of the panel members' scores and the spread of the scores, but no names would be shown. Once the average score was presented, the panel would have a chance to argue whether they thought the score should be lower or higher for that specific criterion. He did note that if they spent too much time discussing a certain criterion, they might never get out of the meeting.

Mr. Dunn explained that panel members could discuss each criterion, but that they could not debate what the final number at the bottom was.

Mr. Archuleta said he was happy with the planning process in that they were now comparing similar types of proposals to each other, but noted that the scoring categories or criteria were not specific to each type of project proposal. He thought they needed to get a separate scoring sheet for each funding category.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He noted that this was the first year they were doing this. He said he had done his best to try to re-work the process, and said there may be all kinds of problems but that year they had to do it that way. He asked the panel members to please take notes for the Friday discussion on how to make the process better. The problem was that the criteria were statutory. He said he and Ms. San Gil and discussed it. They had interpreted it differently, but as long as each panel member consistently followed the same interpretation, it would be okay.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought it was okay if everyone did that.

Mr. Dunn said that because of those things, the process in the RFA allowed for that discussion of how to interpret criteria.

Mr. Archuleta asked if the panel could shift the numbers for individual criterion as they went.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He said the final number for each particular criterion should represent the consensus of the panel. He again pointed out that if they discussed it in depth for each proposal it would be an excruciatingly long process. He said that after a couple of times through, the panel members should have a clear understanding of how they wanted to interpret the criterion. He said they would start with utilization projects and would review all of them first, so the utilization scores would not be placed against planning or implementation proposals. The RFA said two would be funded. He said the panel's job was not to decide which two would be funded but to rank them by scores.

Mr. Dunn said because of the way the description was in the RFA, the regional forester would not be able to fund more than two of the proposals. He did think that as they went along and decided if they would have different criteria for planning, etc. they should decide what those should be, so that they were consistent with their purposes and objectives of the original statute. He said he could use help with it.

Mr. Barrone had a question about item three on the score sheet. The item talked about trees in the project area. He asked if the trees don't exist in the project area if they should get zero.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He said he looked at it as the projects that did would get extra credit.

Mr. Barrone also asked about item 8, which talked about old and large trees. He said if the old trees were in a diseased stand, or was unhealthy; no forester would have a problem with cutting them down

Mr. Dunn said that had always been a challenge in the CFRP. His understanding was that preserving old trees did not mean you could never cut one under any condition. Mr. Barrone said one of the first slides they had seen talked about preserving old trees.

Mr. Dunn said that is statutory language. He said he was there when it was written, and that was language that everyone could agree on. He said it was vague because that was what people could agree to.

Mr. Payne said that was another thing that would work out as long as panel members were consistent. He said he had been on a number of panels, and said that having individual reviewers be consistent was key.

Mr. Vincent said there was a difference between saving all trees or even all healthy trees, and saving enough trees to fulfill the objective.

Mr. Dunn said the panel members should always go back to the core purposes of the program, which was to restore the ecosystem function and reduce the thread of catastrophic wild fire. Those were the core purposes. One of the eligibility criteria to receive a grant from the CFRP was to preserve old and large trees.

Mr. Vincent pointed out that if they continued to take out only small trees, they would end up with a top-heavy forest.

Mr. Dunn said the panel members needed to interpret that language of “preserving old and large trees” in the context of restoring historic fire regimes, ecosystem health, and reducing the threat of catastrophic wildfire, by reducing the unnaturally high number of small diameter trees.

Ms. Burnett had a question on process. The previous year they had relied on the strengths, weaknesses and recommendations to help them score as a group. She said for the current year, it sounded like that was no longer the focus, but were used to help provide feedback, but they would be using the third page with the thirteen criteria to score the proposal. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. Dunn said that was the score. He said the total score should have a relationship between the strengths and weaknesses. He said he would hope that a proposal score of 60, for example, would have mostly strengths and not many weaknesses. He said the way the panel members justified the total score was with the strengths and weaknesses. He said there should be a clear relationship between the total score and the strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Dunn said they had one additional means to think about. At the end, when they had gone through all the proposals, they would have a set of spreadsheets that gave the proposals listed by their score. But the panel also, statutorily, had to consider what the effect on long term management was for a given application. He said that should enter into the panel’s discussions. For example, a planning proposal might have a huge effect on long term management, and so they were required to consider things like that in their recommendations, even though it was not included in the scored criteria.

Ms. Burnett said they would have two simultaneous screens to debate the proposals.

Mr. Dunn agreed.

Ms. Burnett said a problem from the previous year that a proposal with a score of one could not have a weakness at all.

Mr. Dunn agreed, and said that was why the process had been changed so much.

Mr. Payne had a procedural question. Once the proposal was up and the panel was discussing the score, and if they decided to change it, would the score on their personal sheets change?

Mr. Dunn said the individual score sheets were just for them. They were like personal notes, and would not be on the screen, nor would they be available for public review.

Mr. Payne said the final score was displayed on the screen, and was the average based on consensus.

Mr. Dunn agreed.

Mr. Racher asked how the number would change during the discussion.

Mr. Dunn explained that they were only changing the number of a specific criterion. He said that if they were going to argue for a change in a score, they would need to provide evidence based on strengths or weaknesses.

A few panel members discussed the issue of rounding, when they were dealing with partial points in scores.

Mr. Dunn said they could do whatever they wanted within an individual category, but that they could not change the final score. The only way they could “change” that score was by changing the scores in the individual categories.

Mr. Jervis had two things to say. The part about the “old and large trees” had been the most contentious phrase in the legislation for the environmental community. A number of organizations, which had subsequently been more successful in obtaining CFRP grants over the past ten years, had refused to support the legislation because it didn’t include a hard cap, like 15". The language then became vague and a number of groups were concerned that vagueness meant it would disappear as a criterion. To the credit of the CFRP, he noted it was still alive and well, though vague. Mr. Dunn agreed.

Mr. Jervis said the other thing he wanted to say regarded averages. He said there were enough people who had filled out their ratings that he was confident that there would be a spread amongst them. He encouraged people, even if the presenter disagreed with the average, that they trust the statistics of the group and the consistency of individuals within their own rankings. He said, in his opinion, that otherwise, the process would be a mess.

Mr. Archuleta said he was still trying to figure out what made sense. He said it seemed like just accepting the averages almost defeated the purpose of them being there, because otherwise they could just submit their notes and scores and be done, which wouldn’t necessarily be a bad thing. [laughter] He suggested, because the thirteen criteria were so important, that they go through the criteria and base the strengths and weaknesses on them.

Mr. Dunn said the idea of the panel was to share ideas and learn to see something from another point of view. That kind of group learning was the whole reason why they were there. It meant they could have the opportunity to understand something they didn’t before, because of the expertise in the room.

Mr. Dunn said it was possible for a person to be an eloquent speaker, but that would not necessarily change the scores. He said that he had no problem with the sharing of new information, and how it might affect a particular criterion. He said that what had made the CFRP strong was the constant feedback from the panel to the applicants with strengths and weaknesses. He said that was part of the reason why the proposals always got better. The applicants really responded to those weaknesses and strengths, which made for an amazingly quick evolutionary process for the proposals. That made the development of the strengths and weaknesses very important. It made the following year’s proposals react to that feedback, and improved those later proposals.

Mr. Berrens said he would like to emphasize the importance of trusting the consistency of the reviewers. He said he wanted to know what people thought, but said he would be interested in degree of concordance and variation, or standard deviations and medians. He said it was an easy thing to get off spreadsheets, and those numbers really meant something about how people were interpreting the criteria. He thought it would be important to look at whether there was a wide or low variation. He said he just wanted to bring it up, and was wondering if they could look at some other numbers, or if they would just be looking at the mean.

Mr. Dunn said they would see the average and the distribution.

Mr. Dunn, Ms. San Gil, and Mr. Berrens discussed if they could get the other information. Mr. Berrens said he just wanted to bring it up, and other panel members weren’t interested, then he would not bring it up again.

Mr. Jervis and Mr. Racher thought it should include those other numbers.

Mr. Dunn said Ms. San Gil would look into it and see if it could be done. He said at the very least, they would start with the average and the spread.

Mr. Archuleta asked if Mr. Berrens would be willing to help if it was a simple spreadsheet formula.

Mr. Berrens said just being able to see the median would be acceptable if people did not want to deal with standard deviation. He did not want to use any numbers that people weren't comfortable with interpreting.

Mr. Payne said if they had, as appeared to be the case, different interpretations that affected the scores, the standard deviations would be broad.

One panel member said he thought of it more in terms of learning. He said he might look just at his own scores, to do an internal consistency check.

Mr. Archuleta agreed that it would be useful for personal learning. He said he was also concerned, and pointed out that someone could enter all zeros for a project and it would skew the score. He thought that just looking at one or two numbers would not show them the whole story.

Mr. Berrens said there was a button at the top of Excel spreadsheets for the median, and he said he thought they should see median and mean. He said he thought that would be easier than standard deviation.

Mr. Jervis said he would rather see the standard deviation than median.

Mr. Dunn said Mr. Berrens and Ms. San Gil could get together and decide what could be done.

Mr. Barrone said he had a concern that was brought to him by various people. He said there were old businesses that had been in communities for years and years, and now new companies were coming in to compete against them, and were trying to use CFRP funds to do so. It was a concern in a lot of northern communities. He asked if there was any way to factor in the age of the business into the criteria.

The Facilitator said they would look at things they could add or improve on Friday in the discussion on the criteria.

Mr. Dunn said that was a subject he had spent many hours working on. It had a couple of elements. The first was that the statute said to improve the use of small diameter trees. That implied that if someone had a new idea for adding value to small diameter trees then the CFRP was obligated to support that. He said adding value to the material in a way that hadn't existed before might compete with an older business that wasn't necessarily adding value.

Mr. Dunn said that on the other hand, federal grants were not supposed to put existing businesses at a competitive disadvantage, but noted that all businesses were free to apply. Many old businesses had improved thanks to the CFRP, and had applied to CFRP to improve existing equipment that allowed them to improve and add value to small diameter trees. He said he understood what Mr. Barrone was saying, but that developing a way to do that would not hamper the ability of the agency to provide grants to improve and add value to small diameter trees. He said he thought it was a good point for discussion.

Mr. Barrone he just didn't want it to get thrown out, because what often happened was that it lasted for the length of the grant, then it just went back to the way it was

Mr. Dunn said any idea Mr. Barrone had on developing a criterion that would take the need to facilitate new ideas and more efficient utilization without disturbing the sustainability of the communities. Sometimes they were competing needs, and it was a question of wording it so that they could evaluate proposals in an even-handed way to work that out.

Mr. Archuleta said he just wanted to make sure they were clear on taking into account the long term effect of the proposals. By using the score system of the thirteen criteria, he asked at what point the panel would take that into consideration in order to affect the final score. He said he didn't know if it would be for this set of applications or the next, but he didn't know how they would take the long-term effect into consideration if they couldn't change the bottom score.

Mr. Dunn said he didn't know. There were a number of ways they could do it. He said he had purposefully left it in the panels' hands to determine how to incorporate it into the evaluation. He said he did not want the panel to simply argue back and forth about it.

Lunch -12:30 - 2:00

Review / Revise Panel Bylaws

The Facilitator said they had already started the review of the application and evaluation process, which was scheduled for after lunch. She said that they could begin again after lunch by having Mr. Berrens and Ms. San Gil discuss what they had decided, and then they would start with the actual review.

Mr. Dunn said there were a number of ways they could present the scoring information on the screen, since it was the first time they had done it. He said when they got back and started looking at the first application was when they would need to decide what they wanted to do with the information.

Mr. Berrens said if it was a hassle, they should just agree to look at the mean. He said he would be okay without looking at the standard deviation. He thought it would be best to decide up front.

Mr. Payne agreed.

Ms. Burnett said went back to strengths and weaknesses on the score sheet. She said in previous years if there were weaknesses, like administration problems, that had seemed to automatically kick a proposal out.

Mr. Dunn said he was glad she had mentioned that because the forests had provided them with a detailed review of administrative weaknesses, and he said they had done a more thorough job of "preloading" them into the spreadsheet. He said those kinds of things would show up when they displayed the information. He said they had spent eight hours on Friday compiling all those comments so the panel wouldn't have to spend time on them.

Ms. Burnett asked about, as an example, applications that didn't enclose their letters to tribes.

Mr. Dunn said if there was no evidence that they had written letters to tribes that would actually disqualify them. He said he hadn't seen any that were like that.

Ms. Burnett said that was just an example, she said she knew there would be things that would come up where particular weaknesses were not reflected in the thirteen criteria. She said even though they could argue about how strong or weak the proposal was, there were some things that just were not in accounted for in the thirteen criteria. She said there were a number of things that weren't included in the thirteen criteria that were still very important. She said she thought it was important to think about because it could save them time later, in terms of staff hours, when people wanted to know why they didn't get funded.

Mr. Dunn asked how Ms. Burnett would like to deal with it.

Ms. Burnett said she didn't know, because she wasn't sure how the scores would be used.

Mr. Dunn said that for the current year, the report would have, in the planning proposals, highest to lowest quality. He said this was because they were unsure of how much money they would have to fund the proposals.

Mr. Payne said he saw that some of those things she had mentioned might become tie breakers. He said most of the strengths and weaknesses related to one of the thirteen criteria. He said he thought she had brought up a good point that there would be some strengths and weaknesses that did not fit into any of the criteria. He said they would have to figure out as a group how to deal with those.

Ms. Burnett said she thought they should keep in mind what she called the "administrative issues." She read criterion number ten, and said she would argue if the applicants could not present a well written proposal which met all the criteria that they should include it. She said it might affect the panel's ability to score it. She said she wanted to make sure they didn't forget the some of the paperwork issues.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He said he thought Mr. Payne had a good idea about how to have the strengths and weaknesses addressed in the criteria.

Mr. Jervis asked if it would be possible, after staff had calculated all the scores, to see the proposals arranged by score, anonymously, so they could see the whole list of 33 proposals, their scores, and the range of all those scores as a first step that afternoon. He said he thought that would answer a lot of the questions being raised.

Ms. San Gil said she was trying to get that information for them for the first category, which was utilization.

Mr. Jervis said they were dealing with a number from one to five, so outliers weren't a big issue, but if they had an idea where they fell, and how spread they were, it would help the whole discussion.

Mr. Dunn asked Ms. San Gil if she had time to do that.

Ms. San Gil said she had 5 of 8 done and had 3 more. She asked them to describe exactly what they wanted to see, because at that point she was prepared to show them the total score for each one of the Utilization projects. At the request of a panel member, she said she could give the mean of each of the questions. She explained that at that time, every question had the distribution, the mean or average, and the total. In order to do something else, she might have to create a whole new spreadsheet. The panel members discussed what they wanted to see.

Mr. Dunn explained that Ms. San Gil would display on the screen the individual project, its range, average, and total. To his knowledge, Ms. San Gil did not have at that time a spreadsheet that had all of

the Utilization projects with those. She would have to generate a separate spreadsheet to do that, or they could possibly put some of the information on the whiteboard.

They broke for lunch from 12:45 to 2:00

Review Application Evaluation Process

The Facilitator said they had left off with refining the process. She asked Ms. San Gil to talk about what she had done and what the expectation was.

Ms. San Gil said she had all of the utilization application scores on the flip chart. On the screen, she said they had the actual information for each proposal. She explained the example, and where they could see how many people had given a certain score to each of the thirteen criteria.

The Facilitator said, for the record, there were no conflicts of interest for the first proposal, which was being presented by Mr. Archuleta.

The Facilitator said they were a little ahead of schedule, and they had spent quite a bit of time on the review of the application evaluation process and would start early on the proposal reviews.

Mr. Dunn noted that the deadline for submitting scores to Ms. San Gil was midnight that night.

Ms. San Gil said they had actually been due the night before, but she was giving them extra time. She said she had all the scores through number nine, and was going to go make sure she had the rest.

Mr. Archuleta said he had thought they were going to refine the process before starting on the review. He wanted to include as number14 how the project fits into the long-term. He couldn’t remember the exact wording from the statute.

Mr. Dunn said the language was to “consider the effect on long term management.”

Mr. Archuleta said he thought it would be easier to do it project by project, rather than try to do it at the end.

Mr. Dunn said he was hearing that Mr. Archuleta was proposing that they add a number fourteen, and that that would be that “the technical advisory panel shall consider eligibility criteria, and the effect on long term management.” He said his understanding of what Mr. Archuleta was suggesting was that the new criterion number fourteen would be “the degree to which the project contributes to long-term management.”

Mr. Archuleta agreed. He said it should be “How well does the project contribute to long-term management,” on a scale of 0-5, 0 being not at all and five being that it would contribute very well to long-term management. He said they needed to decide if it was long-term for the Forest Service, or watershed health, or long term for the actual project itself.

Mr. Pohlman said he thought it should be “how well will the project advance the principles of CFRP over the long term.”

Mr. Dunn disagreed, and said the language they had used was based on the statutory language.

Mr. Archuleta asked if Mr. Dunn could explain the statutory definition of long term management.

Mr. Dunn said he didn't think the term was defined in the statute, but said from the feeling in the room when that language was written, it meant long-term land management, long term from the context of forest restoration, and the effect on the land. His interpretation was "what is the effect of the proposed project on long-term forest management on federal, tribal, state and county land," whether it was negative or positive.

Mr. Racher asked when they were going to put it into effect.

Mr. Dunn said he thought they should assign a number to each proposal as it was being reviewed.

Mr. Archuleta said at the end, the score would be out of 70 and not 65.

Mr. Dunn said how they kept track of it is not important to him. You can put it together or keep it separate. Mechanically, he thought the easiest way to do it would be to get a total score and then add another column for the long term score to the spreadsheet.

Mr. Racher said he thought that category should carry a little more weight. He said they would have to decide what the weighting would be compared to all the other criteria.

Mr. Dunn agreed it would be better to decide that upfront.

Mr. Bird said he thought doing that might be confusing and slow them down. He said he also didn't think it was in the RFA.

Mr. Dunn said the RFA said the panel would consider the long term effect, etc.

Mr. Bird pointed out it was not included in the thirteen criteria, so the applicants might not have looked at that for their proposal. He said he would rather see it added for the following year.

Mr. Dunn said the panel was required to take it into consideration. In the panel review process, it said "the panel will then review the rankings of the proposal in each of the three matrix tables and consider the effects of the proposed project on long term management. He said it was in the 2011 request for applications. The question was how to do it, and Mr. Archuleta was proposing that the panel consider it as they went through each application. He said they would have to find some way to do it.

Mr. Archuleta said there would not be fourteen criteria but that the "long-term" rating would be separate.

Mr. Dunn agreed, and said that was actually a better reflection of the way the statute read.

Mr. Jervis said he saw two problems in doing it that way. The first was procedural. As they went along, their understanding of this measure was going to change, unless they went home that night and ranked all of them. He said he was concerned that what they thought was the right number at the beginning would not be what they might consider right at the end of the day. He said it would be hard to do because of that inconsistency.

Mr. Jervis said the second issue he had was that he found it really hard to articulate what long term management really meant, and listed several ways it might be interpreted. He thought that was a problem.

Mr. Dunn said the panel would need to define what they thought it meant. If they thought about how they were going to deal with it first, it would be better because they would think about it the same way for each proposal.

Ms. Burnett asked if they were just going to let the unaddressed weaknesses be reflected in their overall scoring, or if they were going to try to address those weaknesses in another way.

Mr. Dunn said the weaknesses were not statutory languages, but were boilerplate weaknesses that were developed by previous panels because they were weaknesses or strengths that had appeared in prior years. They were included in the appendix of the RFA as “examples of strengths and weaknesses identified by past panels.” He said that nine of the thirteen things in the rankings were statutory. The only things in the scoring sheet that were not in the statute were the ones regarding demonstrating capability of successful implementation, facilitating landscape-scale, multi-jurisdictional efforts, priority area for hazardous fuel reduction, reasonable cost or fair market value. He said they could use none of the strengths or weaknesses that were boilerplates from the past. He said their job was to identify strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, so that someone who had not been on the panel could understand why the total score was, for example, a 41 instead of a 10. He said there should be a correlation between the strengths and weaknesses and the total score.

Ms. Burnett said the previous year they had certain weaknesses that could knock someone out of the category. She said this time it sounded like they just had to have a correlation between their ranking and strengths and weaknesses, and they did not have to worry about the fact that if they found weaknesses on a proposal it should be ranked in such a way that it would not be funded.

Mr. Dunn said it seemed like she was still thinking in the context of the categories from the previous year.

Ms. Burnett said she was just trying to be consistent.

Mr. Dunn said if the proposal had a lot of weaknesses, it would make sense that the total score would go down.

Ms. Burnett said that made sense, but said she would have to figure out a way to explain why the proposal didn’t meet a certain criteria, and to justify why she would give a lower score because she didn’t have a category to do so.

Mr. Dunn said her earlier observation about how that might be a part of “have the proponents demonstrated the capability to successfully implement the proposed project” made a lot of sense. He thought her example made sense.

The Facilitator asked if the other panel members were comfortable with the long term management being ranked separately. She said they still needed to figure out the numbers for the rating.

Mr. Archuleta said they needed to decide how it should be weighted and therefore what the total score would be out of.

Mr. Dunn pointed out that the score did not have to be numerical, it could be ranked as high, medium or low, but he said he still needed the panel to give him a prioritized list.

The Facilitator said she thought it sounded like a number was needed.

Mr. Bird suggested they make it a 0-5 scale.

Mr. Archuleta asked if the total score would be 70 or if would still be 65, and just have 5 points added as bonus points.

Ms. Burnett asked if it really mattered.

Mr. Dunn said he thought it would be easiest to use a column for the number for “long-term management,” which they could add to the total score. He said it would be a highly defensible way to do it, and would be easy to understand

Mr. Jervis said that since there seemed to be a general desire to do this, he suggested they add at the end of the discussion for each proposal a show of hands for who felt it was a zero, how many felt it was a one, etc., then Ms. San Gil could calculate the score, which would get added to the hypothetical 65.

Mr. Berrens agreed.

Mr. Gomez suggested writing the score on a piece of paper and turning that in.

The Facilitator asked if he was proposing it could be done more anonymously.

Mr. Berrens agreed.

The Facilitator asked if the panel members were still okay with a 0 to 5 scoring for the long-term management aspect.

Ms. Fisher asked for clarification of the process.

Mr. Dunn said each individual panel member would score it between 0 and 5.

Ms. Fisher she asked if it was just a yes or no response.

Mr. Dunn said he thought what was on the floor was a 0-5.

Mr. Berrens said they needed to have a consistent way to generate a ranking.

Mr. Dunn said Ms. San Gil would then display the average of what was submitted.

Ms. Fisher asked if the scoring would be anonymous. The Facilitator agreed.

Mr. Racher suggested it be 0-10 because he thought it was more important than some of the individual categories and should be weighted more.

Mr. Gomez said there were only 14 scores shown but there were fifteen panel members. Ms. San Gil explained that to him.

Mr. Cooke said he thought there were a number of criteria that were equally valuable, and so he thought it should be weighted the same as the other criteria.

Mr. Archuleta noted that if someone had to step out, their score shouldn’t factor into the average because the scores would be lower.

Mr. Dunn said that would be considered when taking the average.

Mr. Archuleta said he agreed with Mr. Racher that it should have more weight.

Mr. Dunn said the statute separated it out as a separate thing to consider, so it was reasonable to say it was more valuable.

Mr. Olivas said, just from hearing the discussion, if they were going to answer it at the end of the discussion, they should keep it as a yes or no and then have the averages and the number of yeses and nos, that way they would have the weighted average.

Mr. Dunn said that would not help them create a prioritized list.

Mr. Gomez said including it as a fourteenth criterion would make it simpler.

Mr. Dunn said they would have to include that number separately. He said it would have to be included as a separate column on the final spreadsheet.

Ms. San Gil said they could add a fourteenth criterion, and come up with another average. She said she would have to go in to each individual application and add those numbers for a new total and average, but she could do that. She said they would have to be patient, but it shouldn't take too long. She said she thought it might be better than waiting until end of discussion.

Mr. Dunn said the alternative could be more time consuming.

Mr. Gomez thought if everyone turned it in before the proposal it would be better.

Mr. Dunn the point of the panel discussion was that they might learn something that might affect their score.

Mr. Gomez said they would have to discuss the other thirteen again anyway.

Mr. Dunn said Ms. San Gil was saying that they should do it before they discussed the other criteria.

Mr. Gomez asked if they would be able to discuss the number again.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He said that they would go through and do the scoring for each proposal, and then after the panel went through all the proposals then they would review their recommendations for each of the projects to make sure they had dealt with inconsistencies. He said that would also give them an opportunity to take into account any public comment. He said they would then look at all the Utilization proposals on the matrix, and that was their opportunity to consider the long term management. He said that would be their next opportunity to re-examine any and all of the scores.

Mr. Vincent asked what it would mean if the fourteen stayed the same. He said he tried to submit his scores just then and couldn't.

Mr. Dunn explained that the scoring option for Utilization was closed already, and that the others would be closed at midnight that night. He explained that the 14th criterion would be added at the end of the discussion of each proposal.

Mr. Vincent asked if not having submitted his scores would mess up the scoring later on.

Mr. Dunn said it wouldn't mess things up.

Mr. Payne said he thought it was on shaky ground if they entered a fourteenth score that wasn't included on the RFA.

Mr. Dunn said the RFA said the panel would review the rankings of the proposals in each of the three matrix tables, and consider the effect of the proposed projects on long term management. He said they were just creating a mechanism to do that.

Mr. Payne said he just thought they should be careful adding it in as a number fourteen. He said it looked like they were adding an evaluation criterion.

Mr. Dunn said they were adding an evaluation criterion, and that it was one that the panel was required to use according to the statute, the RFA, and the charter. He said they were just trying to create a way to numerically keep track of that so that it was clearly part of their discussion of each project.

There was general consensus that this was how the panel wished to continue.

Mr. Payne said he just wanted to make sure that it was not arbitrary or capricious. He said it would alleviate his worry.

Mr. Dunn said that once the panel had reviewed one or two applications, he was sure they would be more comfortable with the process.

The Facilitator reminded the panel that the agenda for the day said they would review two proposals.

Review Applications

CFRP 01-11 – Northern New Mexico College
2011 CFRP Grant Proposals: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

There were no conflicts of interest for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 01-11
Organization:	Northern New Mexico College
Organization Type:	University
Forest:	Carson
Project Title:	Biomass Fuels Utilization at the Northern New Mexico College, El Rito Campus
Funding Requested:	$182,283
Matching Funds:	$52,794
Total Budget:	$235,077
Evaluation Category:	Utilization

Mr. Archuleta provided an overview of this application.

Mr. Archuleta asked if staff would make sure they had pieces of paper for the additional score. Staff went to get some from the hotel.

The Facilitator said the proponent was on his way but was not there yet.

Mr. Archuleta noted it was a Utilization proposal. He read the title of the proposal, and gave the applicant information. He said the purpose was to purchase and install a biomass boiler to heat 70,000 square feet of buildings at the Northern New Mexico College El Rito Campus. He noted that fuel cost for three years was included in the cost of the boiler. He noted the observations the project coordinators would make. He said the project would provide 20,000 per year to suppliers for fuel wood, and would save approximately $60,000 per year in fuel heating costs for the College. He said the saved money would hopefully be circulated.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought they would just go through the thirteen criteria and address the strengths and weaknesses as they came up. He said then if people were okay with the average, they could move on.

The Facilitator and a couple of the panelists agreed that made the most sense.

Mr. Jervis said the strengths would not correlate.

The Facilitator said the strengths would not correlate until they had gone through the weighting. She said if it had a lower score, it was probably because of a weakness. She asked Mr. Dunn if they were supposed to review the thirteen criteria, and then determine the strengths and weaknesses as they went along.

Mr. Dunn said the presenter was not required to go through the strengths and weaknesses. He said the panel would identify strengths and weaknesses for each application and then assign a score of 0 to 5 for each of the evaluation criteria, indicating how well each had been addressed. He said he thought the panel should address the strengths and weaknesses and then assign a score.

Mr. Archuleta said he wanted to go through the thirteen criteria and discuss the scores, and whether they should be higher or lower based on strengths and weaknesses, because he said that at the end of the day the thirteen criteria would decide if it got funded. He said that meant it would serve the applicants better to get strengths and weaknesses based on those thirteen criteria, rather than just general strengths and weaknesses. He said he thought that if the panel wanted to change a score up or down, they should just do it to the next whole number, and justify it with the strengths and weaknesses. He said he thought that would make the most sense to the applicants.

Mr. Payne said he thought that was okay as long as they covered all the strengths and weaknesses.

Ms. San Gil said she felt that the strengths and weaknesses would drive the scoring, so she suggested they go ahead and list them first.

Mr. Dunn said the RFA said that they would discuss the strengths and weaknesses. He the strengths and weaknesses should be directly driven by that question.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought it would be very lengthy if they had to list and discuss the strengths and weaknesses and then discuss the scoring.

Mr. Dunn said he thought Mr. Archuleta was suggesting they go over the scores and then list the strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Archuleta agreed and Mr. Dunn said that was okay. He said it was reasonable within the description given by the RFA. He said it might be useful to say the strengths and weaknesses of each criterion in the report.

Mr. Archuleta said the strengths and weaknesses he had come up with had been from the previous year's scoring system. He thought many other, different strengths and weaknesses would emerge as they went along. He said he thought the next time it would be better as they went through them.

The Facilitator noted that the first one will be slowest.

Mr. Barrone said there were a few of them that hadn't been there before so they wanted to be able to ride the bull without getting bucked off. He said they had been told a five minute summary, and then a group discussion of the strengths and weaknesses, which would get back to the proponent, so that they would know what to change next time.

Mr. Dunn shared a hypothetical discussion on the first criterion. He said they could state strengths or weaknesses one at a time, and the entire panel could discuss them as they were presented. Before anything was finalized on the screen under strengths, everyone had to be okay with it, or it would not stay, and the same was true for weaknesses.

There was some discussion about the difficulty of which question the strength or weakness would correspond to.

Mr. Dunn and Mr. Archuleta suggested that the panel members simply list the strengths and weaknesses under the criterion being discussed.

Mr. Bird thought everyone was complicating the whole thing. He wanted to go back to the old system to discuss strengths and weaknesses, and forget about the thirteen criteria while the strengths and weaknesses were being discussed.

Mr. Dunn said that was the way he had first envisioned it. He thought if they tried to discuss strengths and weaknesses and the score for each criterion individually it would take forever. He said they might make a note of which strengths and weaknesses applied to which criteria.

Mr. Gomez concurred, but thought they list the strengths and weaknesses first, and then go through the thirteen criteria to see if they needed to change anything, so then they would not have to go back to them.

Mr. Berrens said he liked the intent, but thought they could get bogged down in the length of the process. He said he agreed with Mr. Bird. He thought someone, possibly the presenter, could list the strengths and weaknesses, which the panel could then discuss. The panel members could then cite any of the criteria if needed, and then they could focus on the thirteen scores to see if anyone wanted to change any of them. He thought that would work, and then at the end they could call the question on long term management. He said they had to be fair, and allow a certain amount of time for discussion. He said they had to do their due diligence, but thought that putting layer on layer would force them to have to hurry at the end.

Mr. Archuleta said he wanted the process to be for the applicant. He said he saw a divorce in it. He said that he had been an applicant, and that it would not have helped him to get the strengths and weaknesses separate from the thirteen criteria. He said he did think it made the panel's job easier, but thought it would be more beneficial to the applicants if there was more connection.

Mr. Dunn said they might have to edit the wording of a particular strength or weakness to create more of a link, but he thought it will be faster. He said he understood why the boilerplate strengths and weaknesses had been created, but he thought there was a downside to them in that they were not project-specific.

Mr. Archuleta said he had thought about the old process. He said the last thing he had looked at was the thirteen criteria. He thought if he had gone through the thirteen criteria first he would have done it different. He said he was willing to just move on with the process, but thought they should put in extra consideration for the applicants the next time around.

Mr. Dunn explained how the boilerplates had been developed. He said they could create a whole new set that year, and that it would actually probably be a good idea to do so.

Mr. Berrens said he was encouraged with the distribution of information to the applicants that time. He said there were thirteen items they were supposed to consider, and they would give their average scores and distribution. The applicant had to see that it was a competitive grant situation, and that they would need to see how their application faired in judgment by the panel with others. Having so many strengths or no weaknesses didn't mean they would be funded. He said they couldn't escape judgment, and it became more critical as they went through it. He pointed out that they were given more information, as the panel was giving them scores for the thirteen criteria, which the applicants could really use.

Mr. Payne said he did not think the presenter should list all the strengths and weaknesses, but rather the panel would give them, and should cite the criteria they applied to.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Dunn said the floor was now open for strengths and weaknesses.

The Facilitator agreed.

Mr. Bird had a strength, which related to criteria number six. He said they showed strength number 30, the application monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators. He cited specifically that they were going to do soil nutrient measurements to determine how much

biomass could be removed from the forest floor, and were going to monitor emissions from the boiler, which said to him that they were cognizant of the potential air pollution of those types of facilities.

Mr. Racher said on strength number four was strength for this application, and agreed with Mr. Bird. He said he thought a weakness was that the project did not monitor other funding sources leveraged. He said, to be more specific, recommend monitoring other funds leveraged, such as BCAP, and monitoring utilization of biomass as cord wood, provides meaningful forest jobs as careers. He said cutting fire wood was a job that maybe couldn't keep someone out of poverty, and maybe they were providing jobs, but he wondered what kind of jobs they were.

Mr. Gomez said he thought some strengths were numbers 1, 7, 18 and 19. He said he thought a weakness was that the proposal did not make it clear what was to be monitored.

Mr. Racher disagreed; he thought it was a strength.

Mr. Gomez referred to page 7. He asked how they were going to collect the information, or what kind of measurements they would take.

Mr. Bird said he thought that was on page 6, or in the table on page 7. He read from the table.

Mr. Gomez said they would have to do a stand exam to collect that kind of information.

The Facilitator proposed that they make sure the strengths were clear before they continued. She suggested they go back to the first strength listed and check for agreement. She went to strength #30, and read it. The panel members agreed. She read #21, and asked if there was agreement.

Mr. Gomez said it did not detail how it would be measured. He said "line transit" meant walking around the forest and looking around, but not necessarily collecting data.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought the proponent was looking to do something on treatments that they didn't have to do. As a Utilization application, they didn't even have to monitor what they were doing. There was no requirement for them to monitor what was being done on the implementation side. He said they could purchase the wood and just monitor the biomass, but he thought they were going above and beyond to go out to monitor the collection site. He said he didn't think they could judge the applicant on whether or not it was sufficient, because it was already beyond the scope of what they were asked to do. He said they were not going to cut wood, but were monitoring where it was cut.

Mr. Pohlman said he thought they were proposing to do some monitoring of projects where people were cutting wood in the overall project area. He said that it was not pinned to a certain area, so it made it difficult to know, from the application, what units would be working. He thought the monitoring plan was good, once they decided on the area that they would monitor. He said that, at a different level, this proposal was a blend of utilization and an implementation proposal. Without knowing how many acres they were talking about treating, it was difficult to gauge the overall effectiveness of the implementation site, whereas some of the other proposals that seemed to blend utilization and implementation did say how many acres would be affected. He thought that was a difficulty.

Mr. Pohlman said he did agree with the # 21 strength, because once the unit was identified, there were some really good things that would be monitored, and it monitored things on the utilization and the implementation sides. He just thought they should have included how many acres they would be treating, etc. was more difficult to determine.

The Facilitator said sometimes things could be considered both and strength and a weakness, and said they would look at this again when they talked about weaknesses.

Mr. Gomez said it mentioned specific sites, but did not identify the sites, which he thought was rather contradictory.

The Facilitator asked if Mr. Gomez wanted to add as a weakness that there was a lack of identification on the unit.

Mr. Gomez agreed, and said or where the ecological monitoring will occur.

Mr. Matush said he wanted better detail on how they would measure the fuel cover and depth. He said they had no surface weights, and there was no biomass, and for prescribed burning there had to have that. He said the nutrients they listed would make no difference if they cut the trees, because it would all be atmospheric. He said the monitoring wasn't quite what he was hoping for. He thought there were a few things missing in the monitoring.

Mr. Dunn said it would be more helpful if more specific citation was mentioned.

Mr. Matush said they were not taking any tonnage, which was part of the required monitoring. They were not addressing a core ecological indicator of surface fuel tonnage (herbaceous tonnage).

The Facilitator said it would be helpful if they could take a look at the language.

Ms. Burnett said she thought it was on page 7, item 6g.

Mr. Matush said that is just surface cover. He said they were measuring percent cover, but there were no biomass weights in there. He asked if he had missed it.

Mr. Jervis asked about the chart on page 7.

Mr. Matush said it just talked about depth and litter profile, but no weights were listed. They are talking about going into prescribed burning, but surface tonnage had to be measured.

Mr. Dunn said the required ecological indicator in the request for applications was surface fuels in tons per acre. He said this was a core indicator, located on page 14 of the request for applications.

Mr. Matush also thought it would have been nice if Suellen Strale had a better background in monitoring.

Mr. Dunn said one thing that helped was for panel members to raise their name tag up to indicate that they had language "screen-ready," or had suggested edits to language on the screen, or to get rid of something on the screen, etc.

The Facilitator asked Mr. Matush for language on his other weakness.

Mr. Matush said Ms. Strale's resume was a weakness, as it indicated that she did not have a monitoring background. He said it was a weakness that the key person in charge of monitoring didn't have a monitoring background.

Ms. Fisher said she thought boilerplates 3, 4, and 18 were strengths, and they related to Criterion 5.

Mr. Payne and Mr. Racher thought the project upgrades existing treatment industries were integrated with the project.

Ms. Watson said she had a weakness. The treatment area was unclear on the map provided. She said that on page 7, they said that control sites (sites where removal will not take place) would be monitored similarly. She said they did not indicate where those sites were on the map.

Mr. Bird said he was nit-picky on the monitoring issue, because he thought it would be important as they moved through the rest of the proposals. He said they were talking about Utilization proposals, and on page 14 of the RFA, the language read "projects which remove vegetation must include the following indicators." He asked if the current proposal removed vegetation.

Mr. Matush said he thought measuring biomass was the most important thing out there.

Mr. Dunn said CFRP projects were required to have a multiparty monitoring plan that monitored the activities they would engage in, so if an activity of the proposed project was to remove vegetation, at a minimum they must include those core ecological indicators.

Mr. Bird said he agreed with the biomass. He said they were going to get into that with the three new categories. He said technically, as they were not out there removing wood, a logger is bringing it to them. He said it was other CFRPs that were bringing them the wood, so hopefully those other CFRPs were monitoring the core ecological indicators in the actual implementation process.

Mr. Matush said the application did not say that. He said it would have been a great point for that first proposal. He said there were a lot of things they were doing that didn't tell a whole lot. He said they were going into a prescribed and maintenance burning, but were not providing any tonnage figures.

Mr. Bird agreed, but didn't think it was necessarily relevant.

Mr. Matush said he thought it was a weakness. He said they had 30 plots but were not measuring anything, except depth, which he didn't think was enough.

Mr. Archuleta said he didn't feel that was relevant. He thought they went beyond because they said they would try to monitor, even though there was no real need to do that. They could have just said they planned to purchase the wood. He said they were not overseeing the prescribed burn area. He thought the real purpose was to purchase the boiler, and create a market or industry for the wood they would burn. He didn't think the weakness was relevant.

Mr. Racher said maybe they should compromise. He said it was a Utilization proposal, but in the budget, the CFRP was on the ground, utilizing material, so he thought they needed to meet the ecological indicators that the CFRP would be paying for. Although the CFRP was not paying for the treatment on the ground, they were paying for the monitoring information, so they needed to have ecological indicators.

Mr. Payne asked if they were modifying any strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Bird said maybe he could reword his original strength (#30) and instead of saying "going beyond the core," say proposal monitoring considers helpful additional indicators, like air emissions and soil nutrients.

Mr. Matush said he liked the proposal and all the monitoring, but as Mr. Racher said they included things like soil moisture meters but did not describe why. He said there was no explanation on why they would be doing soil nutrients. He said it seemed like they were just throwing in things to get the panel's attention.

The Facilitator said he thought was weakness was that the proposal includes soil moisture meters, but there was no discussion why.

Mr. Matush said he didn't see it as a weakness, he just thought if they mentioned them they should say why they would use them.

The Facilitator said they would include it as a recommendation.

Mr. Pohlman said, related to criterion number 4, the project was endorsed by the land manager, who identified specific project benefits and pledged technical support.

Mr. Jervis said he was inclined to add weakness number 16 from the boilerplate. Given that they are relying on firewood, he wanted to know if they had any leverage on providers of firewood in terms of safety. He said they made no indication that they would require any safety certification of the operators.

Mr. Jervis had wanted to include recommendation 12 (on his list), from the boilerplate, that the proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground-disturbing activities to account for wildlife needs.

Mr. Racher asked about the recommendation Mr. Jervis had added. He asked if they were proposing ground disturbing activities, and if the CFRP would be funding them, or if it was the fuel suppliers.

Mr. Jervis said it would be the fuel suppliers. He said that was why he had prefaced the safety issue and the fuel issue, relevant to whether those were recommendations or weaknesses were applicable to their fuel suppliers.

Mr. Racher said he was not sure. He said it was important because the Utilization industry had some standards that all suppliers could work with them, and they provided the environmental benefits. He said he was thinking about other utilization proposals and if it would get to the same point for them. He said he did not think the proponent was doing any ground-disturbing activities. He said their ability to monitor that within their budget of what their supplier was doing would be very limited for a project of that scale. He said that would be on-the-ground monitoring when their suppliers were taking that off, and the quality assurance provided with that.

Mr. Jervis asked how that was different.

Mr. Racher said they could say, as part of the contract for the fuel wood, to give them a certificate of insurance that they had workers comp, for example.

The Facilitator asked if they could hold off on that for just a minute to get in some other panel members' comments.

Mr. Archuleta said he was in general agreement, but said if they were going to purchase firewood, he could see them requiring safety as specific to the loader, but in terms of the supplier, it would have to be something specific to the federal regulations. He said their requirements for ground disturbance would not apply if they were purchasing wood from someone on private land. If they were doing it and proposing the implementation themselves, it would make sense to try to regulate it, but he did not think it applied in this case. He said number 6 weakness should be specific to the loader, and possibly the operator of the boiler, which the proponents had discussed in the application. He would not apply the safety requirement to the fuel providers.

The Facilitator asked if he thought they should exclude that weakness.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought if they wanted it to be specific, it should say that there was no mention of the safety of the operators or with regard to the loader, but he would not apply it to the fuel wood providers.

Mr. Jervis said he was more inclined to think they should require workman's comp, or something similar, from their providers. He said he did not want to remove the part about the fuel wood suppliers.

Mr. Dunn commented that, regarding the weaknesses, related to the monitoring issue, the statutory requirement on multi-party assessment, it said each project had to include a multi-party assessment to identify the existing ecological condition for the proposed project area, which he thought meant within the constraints of what they proposed to do, and then had to report, upon project completion, on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project on that area and on the ground results. He said the idea was that the project proponent had to include a monitoring component that monitored what they intended to do with the federal funds the CFRP was giving them. He said he did not think it was appropriate to make them monitor anything outside the purview of what the CFRP was providing federal money for. He said he thought that also related to the language in the RFA that they had to have core ecological indicators for ground-breaking activities. If they were not using federal funds for that, then the panel could not require the monitoring.

Mr. Payne asked if that meant they should take out weakness #2.

Mr. Dunn said it did relate to that, but if they decided to go beyond, and measure things in addition to what they were going to use federal funds to do, then the weakness #3, that the key person in charge did not have a monitoring background, would not apply. He read page 7, where it stated that vegetation data analysis would be conducted by NNMC students and faculty in partnership with the forest guild, etc. to ensure accuracy and consistency in data collection. He said those looked like competent parties for monitoring.

Mr. Dunn said there were two questions. The first was that the grant recipients were directly responsible for monitoring the degree to which they were meeting the objectives they had set out, with the federal funding they would receive, but not anything more than that. He said if they chose to monitor more than that, it did make him wonder why they were doing extra things that they were not receiving federal funding for. He said if they wanted to do it, the other question was whether they had the capacity to do the monitoring. He said the passage from page seven addressed their capacity to do the monitoring.

Mr. Matush disagreed. He said he thought that was a quality control statement.

Mr. Dunn said they could not ask an applicant to monitor things that were not federally funded. He said he was just providing clarifications on statutory language.

The Facilitator asked if he wanted to leave that weakness, in light of what Mr. Dunn had explained.

Mr. Matush said they didn't have to leave it in. He said he read the proposal according to the objective, "the project will help restore and move forest toward a more natural fire maintained condition, reducing the risk of crime fires across the landscapes." He said he did not thing they had sufficient monitoring to do that, not when it came to fire maintain conditions. He said he just took the objective and what they were paying for in the budget and he thought their monitoring was a little shy of that. He said they could take out the weakness regarding Ms. Strale. He said he

thought there was another key person, who was going look at all the soil stuff, who he felt was more qualified.

The Facilitator removed weakness number 3.

Ms. Burnett said there was some conflicting language, too, as to who would do the monitoring. On page seven, there seemed to conflict with what was said on page two. She also noted that on page 3 they talked about stipends paid to crew members to CCC members to do the monitoring. She said The Facilitator could say that the proposal was unclear about who would be doing the monitoring effort. Page 2 states the CCC would be the lead party conducting the vegetation surveys at removal sites, and page 7 said CCC staff would participate in data recording, and NMMC would perform data reviews to ensure accuracy and consistency in data collection.

Mr. Dunn asked about the next sentence, which said the Forest Guild would provide technical support to ensure monitoring approaches are consistent with the approved methods, and would provide training for vegetation monitoring.

Ms. Burnett said she was just pointing out that it seemed unclear. She said they possibly wanted to remove number 3 because of the inconsistency of language between pages 7 and 3.

Mr. Payne asked if they wanted to take out 3 out and keep 7.

Mr. Matush and Ms. Burnett said they were okay with that.

Mr. Berrens wanted to add boilerplate recommendation #10, with regard to discussion of surveys of forest restoration awareness, community awareness, which was on pages 6 and 7. The non-federal match was primarily the building, so there was some question about how that would be funded. He thought they should include that recommendation.

Mr. Berrens also said his interpretation of Mr. Dunn on Mr. Matush's comment was that they could not require someone to monitor something that was not one of the direct activities. He thought one of the objectives was to evaluate the vegetation response to thin forest roles and removal of small diameter wooden biomass. He thought it was important in Utilization that they also think about supply chain characteristics, and he thought it was good that this application did that. He said he thought Mr. Matush was saying that there was a better supply chain quality characteristic to check there. He thought they should keep point number 2. Mr. Berrens said their match was fine, but the question was where the funds for the surveys would come from.

Mr. Cooke said, regarding weakness number 2, he understood that they would be monitoring grasses that would be produced from the removal of the biomass, which would make low-intensity fires in the future. He said he did not think they were taking measurement data for a prescribed fire. He didn't think they needed measurement of surface fuels because that was not part of their proposal. He thought they should remove the second part of weakness number 2, because measurement of the surface fuel was inappropriate because burns were not part of their proposal.

Mr. Racher said he thought they should leave it in there because they were paying for the ecological monitoring. He said that meant they needed to do what was required in the RFA, which was tons per acre, he thought.

Mr. Berrens and Mr. Racher argued what the requirement was. Mr. Berrens said he saw it as outside the scope of the project.

Mr. Racher said since biomass removal and ecological monitoring was included in the work plan and budget, the proponent needed to meet the requirements for core ecological indicators.

Mr. Archuleta said they had said in their application proposal, on page 2, that the Forest Guild would provide technical support to ensure monitoring approaches are consistent with approved methods, etc. He said he thought at some point the Forest Guild had funding through CFRP to help applicants with monitoring.

Mr. Dunn explained the Institute had a contract with the Forest Service to provide technical assistance and the Forest Guild was a sub-awardee.

Mr. Archuleta said if the sub-awardee who received federal funds to do this actually reviewed this project and said it met the core ecological requirements, and went through the process and they went to the sub-awardee of a CFRP contract to help with monitoring, it would be an oversight on their part, even though they did their due diligence. He said he would move that from a weakness to a recommendation that they make it clear that the monitoring included that. They could not hold it against the proponent because they had made an attempt, but it somehow fell through the cracks. He thought they should take out 2 in weaknesses and leave the recommendation.

Mr. Gomez said if they left if they left number 2 in there, then they needed to clarify it. He said he thought it was confusing how they had developed the monitoring plan because it said different things throughout the proposal.

Mr. Payne felt number 6 covered what number 2 said.

Mr. Gomez said they indicated what they were going to measure but it was confusing where and how they were going to do it.

Mr. Payne said it was included in 4 and 5, he asked if it was okay if they took out #2.

Mr. Gomez agreed.

Mr. Matush said the Forest Guild hadn't written this, and they knew what they were doing when it came to measuring biomass. He said he thought they had discussed it enough.

Mr. Matush asked if the applicant was there. Dr. Biggs was present. Mr. Matush apologized about the monitoring problem, because that's not what the proposal was about. He said he liked it because it was trying to find an alternative heating source for the school, but he said it looked very complicated regarding what they were going to do with the boiler. He said if he were a financer at a bank, he wouldn't be able to fund them because he would need an engineering design and a letter from an installer.

Dr. Biggs said that Mr. David Schutz was overseeing the engineering part of the proposal. They had received funding for engineering already; he said the entire district system was supposed to be in place sometime that summer. He said they had worked with two other design energy companies, and they had a plan for it.

Mr. Matush said they had retrofitted everything, then.

Dr. Biggs agreed. He said all they had to do was put in a gas boiler or a biomass boiler.

Mr. Payne said he had been involved too.

Mr. Matush said he was fine with it.

Mr. Archuleta said he wanted to include boilerplate strength #12. He said it created a local market for small diameter timber in the area. He also wanted to add strength #15, as the project had a long term effect; it was part of a landscape restoration effort because it created a market. The market would provide material to enhance the landscape efforts in the Vallecito Sustain Yield Unit. He also wanted to add strength #29, as the project would create new jobs, particularly related to the boiler operation.

Mr. Archuleta said a strength was that the project leveraged other public funding to allow institution of public higher education, to utilize renewable energy to heat a significant portion of the campus.

Mr. Jervis said, after considering Mr. Dunn's comments, he wanted to withdraw weakness #16 about the fuel operators, but said he would pass to Mr. Racher on it.

Mr. Racher said he agreed with removing that weakness. He added the recommendation that the proponents should work with conservation groups to protect nesting bird habitats. He also wanted to recommend that the proponents ensure compliance with federal and state regulations regarding fuel suppliers from federal sources, which could be accomplished by endorsement of New Mexico forest restoration principles.

Mr. Jervis said he thought Mr. Racher was trying to include those two issues in one, which was a way to get around the weakness in safety of operations so they could remove weakness #4.

Mr. Racher also wanted to add to the recommendation that they ensure collaborative forest restoration from fuel suppliers from federal sources.

Mr. Dunn said they could say that the majority of the material had to come from federal lands.

Mr. Racher said the recommendation was to work with conservation groups to meet the timing of ground disturbing activities. He said they could not control ground disturbing activities, but said the facility itself said they wanted the fuel to come from people who used those New Mexico forest restoration principles.

Mr. Dunn said he was unsure about that, and said he also did not understand how they could make #4 as a recommendation. But he said it was acceptable because it was only a recommendation, and not a requirement.

Mr. Jervis said he thought maybe they should just remove #4. He said #8 should read that they encouraged the proponent to incorporate New Mexico Forest Restoration principles from suppliers.

Mr. Dunn said he was really uncomfortable with that because the Forest Restoration Principles was a document that had been approved by a whole bunch of people, but they could not require it. He thought it was really on the edge of what they could ask a grant recipient to do. He said he thought they were allowed legally to include the language about requiring safety, since there was a lot of federal regulation about it already. He said he was not sure that even that was reasonable.

Mr. Racher said he the CFRP, both legislatively and in the RFA, said they would work with a diverse group of stakeholders, which included conservation groups. To get conservation groups to the table, they had sat down with them and asked them what it would take to get those biomass utilization facilities up and going. The New Mexico Forest Restoration Principles were that zone of agreement, or similar.

Mr. Barrone asked if that was something they would put on every one of the applications. He said people would be making money or meaningful jobs would be created by the utilization of biomass. He asked if everyone had to do #2 under the recommendations.

Mr. Racher said his recommendation was part of the socio-economic monitoring, and whether those jobs were above poverty level. He said part of the reason they were asking for funding was lack of jobs, and he wanted to make sure that the jobs they created were meaningful, and above poverty level. He said he was just asking that they monitor that.

Mr. Barrone argued that that particular application they were not required to monitor that. He said they were monitoring the utilization of the wood they were burning, but who was supplying it didn't matter. He said they were agreeing to monitor the jobs, but they were not required to, because that wasn't part of their scope of work.

Mr. Dunn said he didn't think the word "meaningful" was appropriate.

Mr. Payne said they should delete "meaningful" and insert "jobs that pay a living wage."

Mr. Barrone said he wasn't sure if he was okay with that. He said the program depended on people in the community who cut firewood, so if they didn't have anyone that cut firewood in the community; the program would be shut down.

Mr. Dunn said that recommendation either needed to be taken out or changed to what Mr. Barrone would support. He said he understood there could be higher-paying jobs in a biomass operation.

Mr. Racher said it was the kind of jobs they were creating. He said it was paying for a biomass system that utilized cord wood. He said they were paying $100 for a cord of wood. He said that was not wrong, but they were monitoring the jobs, so they should gather information about the jobs they were monitoring.

Mr. Dunn suggested "the monitoring plan could include an evaluation of alternative biomass fuels which could crate a higher paying job."

Mr. Racher disagreed. He said he understood why they went with that biomass system, since they could get a reliable supply of cordwood in that area. He said they were monitoring the jobs. As they moved forward and gained more information on those systems, they should look at what kind of jobs they were creating, whether they were continuing a culture, or if they were just creating jobs that would keep people below poverty level.

Mr. Barrone said most people could afford a pickup and a chain saw, so they could go out and cut the wood. He said in some counties poverty level was $16,000 per year, but people could support their family on that.

The Facilitator said there was no consensus on that point.

Mr. Archuleta said he understood both sides of the conversation, and suggested that the language maybe needed to be more general. He suggested monitoring the economic impact that the use of cord wood at this particular site would have on the local economy. He discussed some of the issues, but said he thought what they really wanted to measure was the economic impact of using cord wood on the region.

Mr. Dunn noted that in the monitoring plan on page 8, in the socio-economic conditions was "reduction of employees at NNMC El Rito Campus was a current condition," and the desired outcome or

indicators of success was increased number of jobs by boiler use, and increased financial benefit to the community. He read the sample measurements, including the financial contribution of the project to the local economy. He said it seemed like they were going to monitor exactly what the panel wanted them to monitor. He suggested taking out recommendation #2.

Mr. Dunn and a couple of the panel members discussed whether to delete or keep recommendation #2.

Mr. Payne suggested they keep the part that they should monitor the economic impact of providing cordwood in this market.

Mr. Berrens discussed the difficulty of asking the proponent to do too much with the large scale of their project. He said they were talking about monitoring the types and duration of jobs and their wages. He suggested that as language, and the panel agreed. He said it was of interest to the CFRP.

Mr. Olivas added two strengths. The first, which was not a boilerplate, was that the project used alternative energy to help mitigate the utility costs. He also wanted to add boilerplate #33 as a strength. He also added the recommendation that the applicant had two pages left of the allotted ten, which could have been used to further explain a component of the proposal, such as the monitoring. The panel wasn't sure they agreed that the proposal needed to be longer. [There was general laughter] Mr. Olivas said it didn't need to be a recommendation, but said it was an observation.

Mr. Berrens said he had specific language on a strength that he would like to add. He said some project had to go first to get everything worked out. He thought their discussion brought up an important point, especially with respect to the project in question. He said the proponents took important initial steps in linking evaluation/monitoring of supply chain characteristics with the utilization effort. He said it was important in terms of long term management. He said it was important that the applicant was thinking about where they would get small diameter material, etc., especially in relation to landscapes, and he thought the fact that this proponent made the linkage was a strength.

The panel reviewed the strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. They moved the first weakness regarding not monitoring other funding sources, to become a recommendation. They also edited some of the language in the weaknesses.

The Facilitator pointed out that weaknesses 1 and 2 were very similar. She asked if the panel wanted to combine them, or take one or the other out. They decided to remove the first and leave the second because it was more specific.

Mr. Racher discussed what he meant, and they changed recommendation #1 to "monitor other funding sources that could be leveraged to enhance their fuel supply (such as BACP)"

Mr. Archuleta said they had not yet identified the locations for monitoring, so they could not appear on the map. He said they would like clarification.

Dr. Briggs said they had not chosen the sites yet because, for the monitoring component, to look at the structure, etc., they wanted to have a control site close to the location. He said they wanted to work with the Forest Service to identify the area that had access to the wood suppliers, and meet those requirements first. He wanted to make sure, for monitoring purposes; they chose locations that they had some control over, so there would be less bias when collecting data, etc.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought it was more of a strength that they were trying to collaborate with the Forest Service to find the most appropriate site.

Ms. Watson said she didn't think it was a strength. She said that with how long they had worked on the proposal, they should know enough about the site to have a general idea where they would do it.

Mr. Archuleta said they couldn't preselect it before funding. He said they were not controlling where the wood would come from.

Mr. Gomez asked how they determined the minimum of 30 plots, if they did not know the area.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought they were trying to set a standard. He said he thought they were making a good effort in working with the Forest Service. He said he thought they would select the site once they were sure they would receive the funds. The Forest Service would control some of that, too, and the individual applicant didn't have control over that.

Mr. Gomez said he thought it was also confusing because they had added monitoring in the budget when they weren't even sure how much they would do.

Mr. Matush agreed with Mr. Gomez. He said they could not make assumptions on it. He said the monitoring plan was clear enough. He said if they didn't have a good idea, then he was worried about the whole thing, but he said he thought they probably had a good idea of where they would be doing the work and the monitoring.

Mr. Vincent suggested they put it into a recommendation. He suggested "the proposal should specify how pilot areas would be designated and monitored."

Mr. Archuleta said it was still out of their control. He said he was okay in leaving it as a weakness. Mr. Vincent was also okay with leaving it as a weakness too. There was a general consensus with leaving it as a weakness.

Review 13 Criteria

The panel then looked at scoring the thirteen criteria.

Mr. Archuleta said he had scored numbers 1and 2 as zero, but said he would re-score them as 4s, in light of the discussion that morning. He said he thought the score should be higher because of the fact that they were creating a regional market for utilization of small diameter timber. He said that was a lasting market, as long as they used the boiler.

Mr. Dunn said his understanding was that as long as everyone used a consistent interpretation or scoring method for their reviews, then it would all wash out. He said it was not about the total score, because as long as the panel was consistent, the scores would level out.

The Facilitator pointed out that it would work out because they were only comparing applications within their type, so all the utilization proposals should have been scored the same way.

Mr. Archuleta said he didn't see the point in even discussing the average scores for the 13 criteria, and thought they should only talk about the 14th. He said he thought they were going to get stuck on the scoring.

Mr. Dunn said that if they did get stuck, they would never get through all the proposals.

Mr. Payne said he didn't think they had time to go through every criterion, but if there was a specific on that they really felt should be changed then they could make a strong argument for it.

Mr. Archuleta said that was what he had tried to do.

Mr. Gomez suggested that they redo their rankings in light of discussing the strengths and weaknesses. He said he thought that would be the easiest way to do it.

Mr. Dunn disagreed.

Mr. Racher said the only other alternative was to change scores based on their discussion, or they could choose a category they thought was low and decide by how much to raise the score for it. He said the problem with the scoring was that the only way to change the score was to poll everyone again.

Mr. Payne said they could build a spreadsheet and enter in the new scores. He said it would be very cumbersome but they could do it.

Ms. Burnett said they already knew how the proposals compared to each other. She said she didn't think that debating one or two points in a given criterion would make a difference in the ranking. She didn't see a reason to get into debating the thirteen criteria. She said they were pretty much just working within the scores they had already provided and were just giving the applicant feedback. She agreed that rescoring would probably be the only way to change the scores would be to totally redo them, but she didn't think they should do that.

Mr. Archuleta said it was done and the scores were decided, and he didn't know why they were going to be there for the whole week just to do the strengths and weaknesses. He said the job of the panel was to make a recommendation, but it was a good that they were helping improve the applications, too. He said they hadn't known what the review process would be like when they were first scoring.

Mr. Racher asked Mr. Dunn what his idea of the process was, and he asked how the projects could move.

Mr. Dunn said his vision was to have the discussion be centered around the specific objectives of the program and the act, and away from just arguing for high scores so applications could get funded. Also, the objective was to try to have more of a strength-based discussion to have some sort of scoring system to reward those applications that did a better job on specific objectives of the act. His idea was that if there were specific things, as a result of the discussion, that they would want to change the score. He said one reason for having the thirteen criteria was so that they couldn't get stuck discussing all of them, and to encourage them to really prioritize. He also said the process they were doing here had more similarity to other federal grants agencies.

Mr. Dunn said the panel setup was meant to allow discussion like the one on firewood and how to do forest restoration. He said those discussions were extremely important because the strengths, weaknesses and recommendations affected the proposals for the following year. He said they did not have time to go own into the minutiae.

Mr. Racher said their discussion for the first proposal was focused mainly on monitoring. He suggested they could look at that criterion. The averaged score for #6 was 3.79.

Ms. San Gil explained the numbers, and said how many of each score the application had received. The Facilitator said she thought it reflected the discussion.

Mr. Gomez suggested asking the panel members to raise their hands if they wanted to change more than one of their scores. He said if each panel member was going to change their numbers in some way, he thought it would change the average.

Mr. Jervis said they had all had the opportunity to rank the applications. He said he didn't think they should revisit them, because it was not reasonable. He said the first application might be difficult, but the process was able to meet the needs. He said there might be changes that some people would change. He said they had done the scores so long ago that they probably didn't remember exactly why they had given certain scores. He said he thought it was unreasonable to rescore everything and they should just trust their original scores. He said if the applications that did not get recommended were very close, then maybe they could go back and discuss them. But he did not think they should go back and redo it all.

Mr. Berrens agreed with Tom. He said he participated in a number of panels similar to this one, and theirs was not an unusual process. He said the panelists had been chosen, and they needed to trust their professional judgment. Rescoring everything might just create a different scale again. He did suggest that they pause and consider the extra element of long-term management. He said they might want to reconsider the weight of that element. He said if they changed it to ten points instead of five that would allow more flex after their discussion.

Mr. Jervis suggested that they retain the 0-5 score, but then double it. That way it would not change how they looked at scoring it, but would also give it more weight.

Ms. Fisher said she was having difficulty categorizing it for the utilization proposals. She thought they should stick with it and make it work, and thought it would be easier for the implementation proposals, and possibly the planning proposals. She liked Mr. Berrens's suggestion for weighting. She said she was finding it a little hard to classify the utilization proposals with the ranking system.

The Facilitator said ranking was another way of approaching it.

Ms. Fisher agreed, and said it would allow them to put more weight there at their discretion.

Ms. Burnett said she felt a little disenfranchised by going with the score she gave before the being a part of the group discussion. Even though it would take time, and they had already invested almost two hours for the first proposal, she suggested they rescore by consensus for the 13 criteria. She said she felt they wouldn't gain anything from having the meeting and all their discussions if they didn't. She said they weren't engaging in really figuring out which was the best proposal, since their scores already determined that. She said she thought they were just playing with the game they had if the only variable was the last criterion. She said she thought it would be more real. She said she didn't think they should redo individual scoring, but thought they should go through each criterion and decide as a group what the score should be. She said she knew it sounded very time consuming, but said the other options did not seem adequate to her.

Mr. Payne said they didn't necessarily want to go through every one of the criteria. He said he thought they should just go down the list and find the ones that seemed really low or really high.

Ms. Burnett said that might only change the overall score by one or two points, so they would just be spinning their wheels for one or two points. She said if they started from scratch, it would be more about what they thought as a group, instead of as individuals. She said she thought that was what it was all about.

The Facilitator asked Ms. Burnett to look at the scores listed to see if she thought they reflected something different than what they had talked about in their discussion so far.

Mr. Payne talked about the difficulty of redoing all the scores.

Ms. Burnett said she understood if no one wanted to, and said she would concede because it was about consensus, but said if she were an applicant, she would have been expecting something similar to the previous year.

Mr. Dunn said the new process had been described clearly in the request for applications, in his memos, etc., and there was no reason that there should be any question about the process.

Ms. Burnett said she understood that the RFA described the criteria, etc., but the idea that the decisions and rankings would be set prior to the panel meeting and that they could not change the scores then might be something that the applicants might not have understood from the RFA. She said she wasn't trying to hold the group up, she was just stating the other side of the issue.

Mr. Barrone said the process was already laid out. He said he thought they did not need to circumvent the system. He said a lot of people didn't like the scores that were up and were trying to change them, but said the panel had a lot of time in their own home to figure out their process, and said he thought they needed to just stick to that. He said he thought they needed to just move on.

Mr. Bird said if someone felt very passionate about one of the criteria, they could lobby the panel to make a change. Otherwise, he thought they should move on.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He said that was how he had intended the process to work. He said they did not have the staff time to completely redo the process. He said the key, overarching element for overview was the effect on long term management, so they could adjust the ranking if they chose to do so.

Ms. Burnett said she didn't know any of the utilization folks, and said she had no preset motives for how they ranked. She also said she did not intend to be contrary. She said she understood what the rules were, she just want you to make sure they knew she was not trying to overthrow the panel.

Mr. Gomez said he was concerned that they were trying to change the weakest part of the application, instead of looking at the strengths.

he Facilitator asked Mr. Gomez if he would do something different based on the strengths. She gave the example that everyone had agreed that the proponents were not going to replant trees, which gave that a low score. She asked if he would advocate for something different based on the scores he saw.

Mr. Gomez said if they were going to look at strengths and weaknesses, they would have to look at each one. He thought the only way to do that was to re-rank them.

Mr. Payne asked which one of the rankings he would change.

Mr. Gomez said there were about 8 of them. He said they might be different from other panel members, and thought they could be there all day.

Mr. Archuleta said he also did not have a vested interest in any of the projects. He said he agreed with a lot of what Ms. Burnett and Mr. Gomez had said. He said some issues had been raised that he had not thought about before. He said, when looking at #6 for this application, the majority of the scores were 3s, 4s, and 6s, but the score was only a 3.79. He said 0s could skew the scores and lower the average. He said maybe the median should be the number to go with rather than the mean. He said it was a new process, so it wasn't perfect, but just wanted to bring it up. He said the scope changed when they had the discussion.

He said if they were going to stick to the scores they should just stick to them and not go through the week-long process.

Mr. Dunn also said they were forgetting the long term criterion, which could have a huge impact on the final score depending on how they weighted it.

Mr. Gomez said they could have done the 14th criterion before, and he asked why they were there discussing it if the scores were already set.

Mr. Vincent said he thought they should just go through the list, and if no one had an issue, then they should just go on to #14.

Mr. Pohlman said this process set certain things in motion. He said when he thought about his rankings, and how close so many of them were in scores, it would make a big difference to have a 14th criterion. He said he also wanted to echo what Ms. Fisher had said, that it was difficult for utilization proposals, because he had not seen a good fit for many of the criteria.

The Facilitator said the strengths and weaknesses and administrative issues were things that would help the proponents. Looking at the scores as they stood, she asked if any of them would change based on the conversation. She pointed out that they had the most influence on #14, and weighting that criterion would give them the opportunity to create a fair process where they would have an opportunity to do more for the projects. She suggested that the perhaps spend a bit more time deciding on how that criterion was weighted.

Mr. Archuleta suggested they not spend time on strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Dunn said they were required to deal with the strengths and weaknesses. He said this was because of transparency, and because they drove the future proposals.

Mr. Archuleta said the criteria would also drive future proposals.

Mr. Dunn agreed, as those were the statutory objectives in the Act. He said they had to provide something other than a numerical rating for the applicants in order for them to understand their score.

Mr. Archuleta said the strengths and weaknesses were not reflected in the score, because their discussion on strengths and weaknesses came after their scoring, and the scores were already set. He said they could all just submit strengths and weaknesses along with their scores. He said he was having a hard time relating the two together.

Mr. Dunn said the RFA described the process. He said they had to stick with the process. He apologized if they did not like it, but they simply did not have the staff available to do what they were requesting. He said they could not change the whole process. He said they could have a full discussion of the process and what changes to make, etc., on Friday.

Mr. Archuleta said he was not advocating for changing the process. He said he had wanted to look again at criteria 1 and 2, but others had not.

The Facilitator said they had all agreed on the process and said they had leeway.

Mr. Bird said they had leeway in that they could change one of the criteria, and they had leeway in the 14th criterion, which was about 7% of the total score, which was significant. He said they had leeway, but they just had to convince the rest of the panel.

The Facilitator said it appeared that they would probably not get to the second proposal that night. She noted that Mr. Barrone would not be there the following day, and he was supposed to present it, so the proponent would have to stay overnight.

Mr. Archuleta said he felt the rankings for 1 and 2 should be changed. He said he had changed them to a 4 based on their discussion. He was advocating for them to be bumped up.

Mr. Bird said he had scored the proposal fairly high, and did not want to make any changes.

Mr. Gomez said he had scored them low also, and would like to increase it.

Mr. Cooke said he scored them low, but he didn't want to change the scores. He explained his reason for scoring #2 low.

Mr. Archuleta said he would ask for a 3.

Several people opposed raising it.

Ms. San Gil clarified that for the current year they were only going to fund up to 2 utilization proposals and no more.

Mr. Payne and Mr. Archuleta discussed the possibility and issues of rescoring the proposals individually. Mr. Payne noted that part of what was causing the issue was that people had seen which ones were ranked highest and therefore most likely to receive funding.

Mr. Archuleta said the only way the discussion on strengths and weaknesses could affect the score was to actually take them into consideration.

The Facilitator said the missing piece was that they did the scoring and the strengths and weaknesses separately.

Mr. Archuleta agreed, but said it was unfair to the applicants to have to travel all the way there if it was already predetermined.

Ms. San Gil pointed out that the strengths and weaknesses had been included in the evaluation. Mr. Archuleta said there were many new ones that had come out in the discussion.

The Facilitator said there had been a lobby for raising the score on #1, but there was not a consensus. She asked about #2, or if there were any others.

Mr. Barrone said he wanted to change the score for #6. He thought it should be a 5.

Mr. Payne said that if the panel chose to rescore, everyone would not know the new score until the report came out. He said they could have the discussion, rescore them, and staff could re-tally them later.

Mr. Archuleta, Mr. Payne, and Mr. Dunn discussed the fact that they would not know which proposals, if any, would receive funding anyway.

Ms. San Gil said she thought that would introduce a bias.

Mr. Dunn said the idea of the panel was that through discussion, their view of the world might change. One way they could do it was to re-score everything, with the strengths and weaknesses, but the final scoring would not be known until the final report that came a few weeks after the process.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought it would be less bias to do it that way. The only thing that would affect them was their discussion. Then they would discuss the 14th criterion and decide on a score for that. Then they would not have to lobby whether it was higher or lower, and the scores would be based on their discussion.

Mr. Dunn said that was an option.

Ms. Burnett recommended that they not leave that night until they had reviewed the second proposal. She said she also thought whatever they decided; they should implement it before they left. She said it would make her feel better.

Mr. Dunn said he understood there to be one option that they could choose, but they would not be able to know the scores right away, because they could not commit the staff time to it.

Mr. Archuleta said it allowed them to make an informed decision based on their discussion of strengths and weaknesses. He said he was a more informed scorer after than the discussion than he had been before.

Mr. Dunn said the final score would result in a final ranking of the proposal, along with strengths and weaknesses. The panel members just would not know the outcomes when they left.

The Facilitator clarified that the option was for the panel members to still list the strengths and weaknesses for the next application, but would then resubmit individual scores.

Mr. Dunn said they would do that for every proposal thereafter.

The Facilitator suggested a five minute break and then come back to decide.

Mr. Jervis noted they would then not see a list of the scores. Staff agreed.

Mr. Barrone asked if there was any legal ramification.

Mr. Dunn said there were none that he was aware of. He explained that the process described in the RFA was that the panel would come to agreement on a rating for each of the 13 criteria.

The panel took an approximately 12 minute break at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Dunn resumed the session by stating that the RFA was a legal document that the panel was required to follow. He proceeded to read the direct the panel had to follow in terms of the evaluation process as described in the RFA ("The panel will identify strengths and weaknesses for each application, and then assign a score of 0 to 5…etc."). He said they had to stay within those parameters.

Mr. Gomez said they were supposed to list strengths and weaknesses, and then assign a score of 0-5 to each criterion. He said they had already done that.

Ms. Burnett said it didn't say whether it was individual or group ranking for each proposal, so she thought they could still go with the idea that had been proposed before the break.

Mr. Dunn said that with the way the RFA was worded, he thought they had to look at all of the proposals to check for consistency. After going through all of the proposals, they had to have a credible way of saying they had addressed the issue of long term management.

Ms. Burnett said it could be an individual check of their personal consistency.

Ms. San Gil reminded the panel of how consistency had been checked in the past, using strengths and weaknesses.

Ms. Burnett said they would still be able to do that if they discussed the strengths and weaknesses before individual rescoring. She discussed the possibility of doing it that way and then addressing consistency when it was scheduled.

Mr. Payne said they had got hung up the previous year on the strengths, etc., but the current year it was more specific to the thirteen criteria. His hope was that they would not get hung up on it. He said he thought this painful discussion would lead them to be more consistent, and therefore a consistency check would be easy.

Mr. Archuleta asked if it was possible to just redo the survey in surveymonkey, or just redo it somehow.

Mr. Payne said he thought they could just do it on paper, and they could enter the scores manually.

Mr. Archuleta said he didn't see that being too much more difficult.

Ms. San Gil said at the close of the discussion of each application, they would be handing her 15 sheets of paper. Typically she and Mr. Payne traded off on entering strengths and weaknesses. She said it wouldn't be through surveymonkey, they would do it by hand. She said Mr. Payne seemed confident that they could do it. She explained that they would have to enter the scores for each of the 15 panel members, by hand, for each of the 33 proposals. She said they could do a spreadsheet with the averages once they had entered all the numbers. She also pointed out that there were a number of people who had not yet entered all their scores, so they would not even use the survey, and they would start over.

Mr. Payne said, staffwise, he thought they would be able to do it.

Ms. San Gil just reminded them that no matter what they decided, they would have to stick to the description in the RFA.

Mr. Archuleta pointed out that they had not followed that process in the RFA because they had not talked about strengths and weaknesses and then ranked them; instead they had ranked them first, so the ranking had no reflection on the strengths and weaknesses. He said he thought the process they had used for the first proposal actually went against the language in the RFA.

Mr. Berrens said he did not think what they had done was inconsistent with what was in the RFA, because they discussed strengths and weaknesses, and then were able to decide on whether to change the ranking. He said there had just not been consensus on changing the ranking.

Mr. Dunn said he was hearing that the panel's preference was that they would discuss the strengths and weaknesses, and come to agreement on those, and then each panel member would individually do a score and give it to staff. He said he could not guarantee that staff could compile the data quickly enough to comply with the consistency requirement by Friday.

Mr. Racher said they had a score for each proposal, and in the discussion they had the variation to determine how the proposal contributed to long term management and that gave them the chance to add another score. He thought that doing a revote would be a manipulation of the system.

Mr. Archuleta said if the panel members didn't see what the scores were, there could be no manipulation. He thought debating to raise or lower the scores tended to manipulate the system more.

The Facilitator said the panel would not look at the scores again. She said there was an idea that they could just do the first two proposals over.

Ms. San Gil said they could go through the strengths and weaknesses for the second proposal, and could do the rankings for the first two proposals. Then staff could make extra copies of the evaluation forms for the rest of the proposals, so that they would turn in the form at the end of the discussion of each proposal. She said the other thing they could do is to continue with the average and debating whether to raise or lower the scores. She said they could have spreadsheets, because they had some offers for help, but they would not have the final rankings across the three categories until just prior to the consistency review on Thursday.

Mr. Archuleta said if they did rescore, he thought they should not look at what the scores were. He said they could have a discussion about individual criteria, but only in terms of strengths and weaknesses, etc., to make a case for a high or low score.

Mr. Dunn said the panel would not even see the total score until Friday when they brought back the whole table.

Ms. San Gil asked why they would even discuss the 13 criteria after discussing the strengths and weaknesses.

Ms. Burnett said not all of the strengths and weaknesses were necessarily tied to the criteria.

Mr. Dunn said if the strengths and weaknesses were not tied to the 13 criteria, then they should not be included in the report. Mr. Dunn and Ms. Burnett established that the strengths and weaknesses given should relate directly to the 13 criteria, but that the panel was not limited to the boilerplate strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations from the previous year. Mr. Dunn said the only issue was that a single strength or weakness might relate to multiple criteria, in which case they could do some type of shorthand in parentheses for which of the thirteen it related to.

Mr. Dunn gave an overview of the proposal on the table: starting with the second proposal, the panel would identify strengths and weaknesses, tying them to specific criteria. The panel would then score the proposals. He asked if the panel wanted to include some conversation on long term management so at the end they were not starting “cold.” He said he did not think it was inconsistent with the process. He thought it made sense to create a separate column for the long term management on the score sheet. He said they would not see the final average until Thursday or Friday. He asked if any of the panel members had a problem with that procedure.

Mr. Jervis said he understood the process to be that they would re-rank each proposal as they went along and then address the panel’s consistency at the end of the week.

Mr. Dunn agreed.

Mr. Jervis and Mr. Dunn clarified the process. Mr. Dunn said he thought it made sense to address the issue of long term management as they went along, instead of at the end. He also said it made sense to keep that score in a separate column. He said the discussion of the categories and three tables at the end would include effect on long term monitoring, but thought they should look at it as they went through the process. He proposed that when they did the ranking at the end of discussion, they include it at the bottom of the score sheet.

Mr. Barrone asked if they would have to do that for each category of proposal.

Mr. Dunn agreed. He said whatever procedure they decided to follow had to be maintained for every proposal regardless of the type. He said some panel members had expressed that the thirteen criteria were difficult to apply to some utilization projects, but said that was because they had not envisioned utilization-type projects when they had written the federal bill.

Mr. Berrens asked if they were doing the first project. Mr. Dunn agreed, and said they would include a score for each of the 14 criteria.

Mr. Racher said he thought they were manipulating the scores by doing it that way. He felt that this didn't allow them to take the strengths and weaknesses into effect.

The panel discussed whether the process would manipulate the scores, and the pros and cons of both processes being considered. Mr. Payne didn't think the scores were being manipulated, and Mr. Dunn didn't either.

Mr. Dunn said there was nothing in the RFA about how the panel would assign a score.

Mr. Archuleta said he thought it would help to have the discussion on the thirteen criteria in addition to the discussion on strengths and weaknesses. He cited a couple of examples of criteria that he would want to discuss before scoring. He suggested getting input on any criteria after they had discussed the strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Dunn said he thought the rescoring process would go a lot faster than the original process. He said he thought there was a general consensus to use the rescoring method for the proposals.

The panel decided to score criterion 14 on a 0 to 5 scale, which would be viewed separately from the total averaged score at the end of the entire process. The panel decided that they would have a "total" column which included the 14th criteria.

The Facilitator asked that the panel members have the language for their strengths and weaknesses ready before giving them.

CFRP 02-11 – Santa Fe Firewood and Landscaping

There were no conflicts of interest noted for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 02-11
Organization:	Santa Fé Firewood and Landscaping
Organization Type:	Business
Forest:	Carson
Project Title:	Collaborative Canjilon Forest Watershed Restoration & Utilization Project
Funding Requested:	$357,952
Matching Funds:	$89,580
Total Budget:	$447,532
Evaluation Category:	Utilization

Mr. Dunn introduced the Ranger from the Canjilon Ranger District, who had a comment he wished to make.

Ranger Anthony Madrid said the Canjilon Ranger District supported the proposal, and they thought it was a great project. The Canjilon Ranger District was focused on multiple vegetation management projects in order to restore forest stands and watershed. The project fit well with their current program of work. The project would provide forest restoration by thinning and harvesting trees, and also providing an outlet for small-diameter timber. The Canjilon Ranger District had two NEPA-ready decisions that opened itself to the proposed project. They fully supported the project.

Mr. Barrone presented the second proposal. There were no conflicts of interest for this proposal.

Mr. Barrone said the two proponents were present. He said the project would clean ponderosa trees of small diameter, through already established contracts. He said new trees and grasses would be added where appropriate. He said the Santa Fe Fire Wood and Landscaping was well established in the community, and had the goal to expand their business, create new jobs, etc. Their intention was to assist the community by donating fuel wood, and by creating a safe escape route along Highway 15. It would reduce the intensity of wildfires and improve forest and watershed restoration, as well as protect wildlife habitat. He discussed the partners. He listed the items the Santa Fé Firewood and Landscaping needed to complete their project, and the ways in which those items would be used. Federal funding requested was $357,952, and the nonfederal amount was $98,579 for total of $447,532. The main contribution of nonfederal funds would be supplied by the company itself.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Bird said a strength was that the proposal had a wide variety of collaborators, related to criterion 5. He included boilerplate strengths 1, 2, and 3, all as they related to criterion #5.

Mr. Gomez asked the proponent about the firewood kiln purchased in years 2 and 3. He asked if the kiln would be $90,000, or if two kilns would be purchased for $45,000 each.

The proponent stated it would be two kilns at $45,000. He explained that was because of the volume of material they planned to produce. The units they planned to use utilized waste wood in order to heat the kilns, so there was total utilization of their project material.

Mr. Gomez proposed boilerplate strengths 8 - 18.

Mr. Olivas proposed boilerplate strengths 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, and 33. He had a question on 33, because the project would utilize wood from another CFRP project. He noted they would also be cutting their own wood.

Mr. Matush said he needed some more information from the applicant. He said the proposal called for cutting approximately 130 acres, with 3-5 cords per acre, which would give approximately 700 cords. He said they had 2000 cords the previous year, but their goal was 5000 cords, so he was assuming they had more acres, and a crew large enough to meet their goal. He said they had 3 people on just 20 acres. He said they had 7 people to do 55 acres, he thought that was a lot of people for so few acres. He asked them to justify me why they would need two trucks and two goosenecks with that small a crew.

The proponent said the NEPA document they signed was designed for approximately 9000 acres, so the intention of his proposal was to build capacity in order to meet those needs.

Mr. Matush said it seemed like the bulk of the budget was for transportation, although the proponent had not made it clear that transportation was an issue.

The proponent said they were building capacity in order to meet market demands. He said Mr. Knox had contacted the BLM and others to show there was capacity for other acres to be done besides on forest service.

Mr. Matush said the issue was not the availability of acreage, but the crew's numbers. He said he thought seven people should be able to cut 355 acres in a year, not 55.

The proponent said it was due to the fact that a large part of the budget was going to the trucks. He said they would cut much more than that, but it would be done with the business's money, not grant funds.

Ms. Fisher asked if the 130 acres was easily accessible.

The proponent agreed it was.

Mr. Barrone said the NEPA process was complete, and so proposed boilerplate strength #6.

Mr. Cooke said it was a strength for him to keep large healthy trees, which was boilerplate #15, and had already been proposed.

Mr. Berrens said he wanted to add specific language for a strength. He said it was a strength that the thinning targeted a community's primary transportation route, in terms of access, and safety and evacuation issues.

Mr. Racher said he thought boilerplate #11 was a weakness. They asked the applicant if the majority of the material would come from public land, as opposed to private.

The proponent said it would come from a variety of different areas.

Mr. Barrone said it was mostly from public land. He explained that in the construction of the grant proposal, and effort was made by the Canjilon Ranger District as well as the El Rito Ranger District that they had several CFRP grants that were all on public land, and they dealt specifically with BLM grass for project areas, etc.

Mr. Dunn said the majority, if not all of the material would be coming from BLM forest areas.

They excluded weakness #11. Mr. Racher said he didn't think it was a weakness, because there was a letter from the Forest Service, but said the application itself did not state that the safety of the operators would be assured. He wanted to include a recommendation that the applicants assure the safety of the operators.

The Facilitator and Mr. Barrone cited page five, the first paragraph, and the recommendation was withdrawn.

Mr. Racher also wanted to add as a recommendation that the project should more thoroughly monitor the capacity improvements, since it was largely a utilization proposal. He said most of the monitoring was proposed for the implementation aspects of the proposal. He said there was no monitoring of how much wood was going out, etc.

Mr. Bird said it was a strength that they had an established market. He said it related to criterion #10 on successful implementation. He said they had a well-established market that demonstrated that they had not only capacity, but a longer-term ability to continue the business.

Mr. Jervis added boilerplate strength #20, and boilerplate weaknesses # 33 (the application and budget do not address anticipated program income) and 34 (the application does not include the core CFRP ecological indicators).

Mr. Dunn said it was on page 14 of the RFA. He said if there was one core indicator missing, it would be best to be specific.

They determined that each of the core indicators was addressed in various parts of the proposal. Weakness #34 was removed.

Mr. Pohlman added as a strength that there was a support letter had been provided by the District Ranger that verified deliverables and costs, pledged District support, and committed to post project prescribed fire.

Mr. Cooke suggested they change weakness #33 to a recommendation, citing that the proposal could be strengthened with a business plan or good discussion of anticipated income. He didn't think it was a weakness because it was designed to eventually generate business, but the initial elements dealt with machinery.

Mr. Jervis thought it should remain a weakness.

Mr. Dunn explained that if there was income generated during the implementation of a CFRP proposal, or any federal grant proposal, that income had to be accounted for as program income.

Boilerplate #33 remained a weakness.

Ms. Burnett added weakness that the commitment letter from Rocky Mountain Ecology, LLC, did not confirm the monitoring cost shown in the budget.

Mr. Gomez added the strength that the proposal included good, legible maps of the project area. He also wanted to add the strength that the proposal included good collaboration and commitment letters identifying what role each partner and collaborator would provide.

Mr. Matush said he thought the cost per acre was a little high, added the recommendation that the proposal could have been strengthened if the proponent had provided more information on additional treatment areas.

Ms. Fisher added boilerplate weaknesses #15, and 17.

Mr. Bird said he thought it sounded like they had talked a lot about established market. Ms. Fisher and Mr. Bird discussed weakness #15. Ms. Fisher said she didn't think the market letters established what they would be creating, and how much and what they would be selling.

Mr. Payne said the last part of weakness #15 said there was no way to evaluate the viability of the business proposal. He thought the letters disproved that.

Ms. Fisher said she would exclude #15 as a weakness.

Ms. Watson noted that they addressed the products they would sell on page 4.

Ms. Fisher agreed to remove weakness #17 as well.

Mr. Pohlman said, regarding Mr. Matush's comment, the application mentioned an impending 9000 acres of additional thinning in utilization, pending March 6. He said he thought the Ranger also mentioned in his comment that there was lots of acreage that would be available for contracts.

Mr. Matush said there was never a shortage of wood, but he thought it should have been mentioned more specifically in the planning, because of how much equipment they were requesting. Mr. Matush said it was his recommendation that they include more than 130 acres in the planning.

Mr. Olivas cited the second paragraph on page 3 of the application, which provided details of other opportunities for treatment areas.

The applicant explained that they could only do 130 acres because the majority of the money was going into purchasing the equipment, so the number of acres in the proposal had been reduced. He said that was why they had included the letters, etc. regarding additional acreage.

Mr. Matush said he thought it would have strengthened the proposal if they had added more planning acres in their maps. For that kind of equipment, he thought they should just add more acreage.

Mr. Dunn said he thought Mr. Matush was asking for a more specific reference to where those acres might be.

Mr. Berrens said he wondered if #2 could be tied to Mr. Matush's comments. He said he said if there was a business plan, and the business plan could be linked to expect future treatments. He thought a business plan including anticipated future income would have strengthened the proposal.

There were no more suggestions so they scrolled through the list of strengths, weaknesses and recommendations.

Mr. Pohlman asked about training students to plant trees, but said he had not seen anything about planting trees in the application.

The applicant, Shawn Knox, discussed where the tree planting was described. He said they had a schedule. There was not a specific acreage.

The panel then completed their scoring for the fourteen criteria.

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

Review Of Day's Work And Agenda For Tuesday, Day 2

The Facilitator said the panel could leave their boxes, but not their computers. She said there were no additional public comments. She noted that after their revisions, the process was working much better. The panel agreed. She noted they had 10 proposals for the following day. They would be starting at 8:30.

Adjourn

The panel adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

April 26, 2011

Review Agenda

Facilitator Rosemary Romero mentioned Dan Barrone would be out for the entire day due to another commitment.

The public attendees were advised of the sign in sheets located in the back of the room.

The panel was advised that conflict of interests would be noted at the beginning of each project for the record and there were 10 proposals to review that day. The panel was reminded that when the strengths and weaknesses were discussed it would be important to remember they could provide the proponent with good feedback and the strengths and weaknesses would not be recorded on the chart unless there was consensus.

The panel was encouraged carefully consider the strengths and weaknesses and be prepared to provide clear direction of whether they agreed, had a change of language or wanted to make a recommendation. The panel was reminded that the matrix passed out at the end of the discussion would include the proposal number but should not include the panel member's name.

Time for general comments would be provided on Thursday when the applications were reviewed for consistency.

A recommendation for next year on how to group CFRP proposals was considered and noted that RFA programmatic questions could be discussed on Friday. Panelists were asked to make note of anything along programmatic lines as they were important. Every past recommendation from the panel for the review process had been incorporated.

The panel would do a process check on Thursday to check and discuss scores when the utilization proposals were finished. The panel would get the check list when they do the strengths and weaknesses so they could start to score.

Review of Applications

CFRP 03-11 Rev. 1 – Picuris Pueblo
2011 CFRP Grant Proposals: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

Danny Gomez left the room due to a conflict of interest.

Project Number:	CFRP 03-11 Rev. 1
Organization:	Picuris Pueblo
Forest:	Carson
Project Title:	Cemetery Pines Forest Restoration
Funding Requested:	$240,000
Matching Funds:	$60,000
Total Budget:	$300,000

Tom Jervis provided an overview of the proposal:

The Cemetery Pines Project has three objectives.

1. To complete thinning on 57 acres in the Cemetery Pines area. Primarily utilization, the project has a separate contract in place for $50,000 to the BIA/NPA (Bureau of Indian Affairs /Northern Pueblo Agency) for thinning. NEPA clearance was done and bio mass removal would be done by Picuris Pueblo. The large trees will be transported to the Pueblo Forestry yard for vigas, latillas and firewood and smaller trees would go to the Forestry Department charcoal plant.
2. Small diameter trees would be processed into charcoal for the outside market as an ongoing process. Chip and mulch slash would be created for forest restoration. A CFRP grant in 2007-2010 allowed the Pueblo to "successfully operate a mushroom lab and charcoal plant." The proposal stated the mushroom production proved to be unsuccessful however the charcoal production continues and uses salvage from the forest. All biomass from Cemetery Pines thinning would be used. Implied production is 33,000 pounds of charcoal per year from this project and would sell for $1 per pound.
3. Community partnerships would be created to educate the community and local constituents about the significance of the Pueblo Forestry Restoration Management Plan and would include outreach, education, quarterly communication meetings and newsletters. SPOT would collaborate with the local Hispanic communities. The Pueblo, the Forest Guild and SPOT will provide education to Peñasco Public Schools, the Natural Science Program and the Picuris Youth Summer Program and all will participate in the multi-party monitoring. The project includes a socio-economic component about training, job training etc. Parametrix and Forest Guild will support the multi-party monitoring.

Partners include Parametrix; Camino Real Ranger District on Carson for the FS (Forest Service) Peñasco Public Schools, the SPOT Peñasco Picuris Wellness Coalition and the Summer Youth Program. Pueblo Ohkay Owingeh will purchase the vigas and latillas. The Forest Guild will help with monitoring; the BIA/NPA Forestry Department will participate and do thinning on the 57 acres.

Panel Discussion

Ms. Burnett- looking at the definition on *conservation group* in the RFA- asked if the Forest Guild is considered a conservation group.

Mr. Bird - considered the Forest Guild a conservation group.

Mr. Racher - the definition has changed from last year and in the past the Forest Guild was not included.

Mr. Dunn - In the past there was no definition and the panel spent a lot of time discussing if an organization was a conservation group. The RFA now has a definition that has to be used.

Mr. Matush - added strengths #18 and 21. He found $47 per acre for the 57 acre project steep. He visited the Pueblo and when he asked where to buy the charcoal, no one knew. He made a recommendation- *The marketing plan was lacking.*

Ms. Burnett - added strengths #1-3 and# 9 and added weaknesses #5 and 9 (no application provision for preserving old and large trees.)

Mr. Racher - strength #1 was a weakness because there was no documentation with other tribes except Ohkay Owingeh. He added weakness # 6- the application did not include documentation of consultation with tribes.

Mr. Archuleta - It was discussed the previous year that tribes would not have to consult with other tribes. If that was a weakness, it wasn't boilerplate.

Ms. Watson – thought the Pueblo would want to contact at least the surrounding pueblos that might be affected.

Mr. Dunn - the comment was more about collaboration with surrounding … it was different than acquiring letters from other tribes.

Ms. Burnett - the weakness could remain; she wouldn't argue there wasn't strong collaboration just because the letters weren't sent.

Mr. Racher- agreed and suggested language - *The proponent did not demonstrate collaboration with surrounding tribes.*

Ms. Watson - there was collaboration with Ohkay Owingeh - that doesn't really fit.

Mr. Archuleta – that puts an unfair requirement on the Pueblo if they have to collaborate with all the tribes and the panel would have to do that with everyone.

Mr. Dunn - read language from the RFA (page 15): "Tribes that are submitting proposals from projects that are entirely on their lands are encouraged to seek letters of support from other potentially affected tribes; at minimum tribes should consult with other tribes that were located immediately adjacent to their boundaries."

Facilitator – asked the panel if weakness #6 stayed, changed or moved.

Mr. Payne - suggested language: *with all adjacent tribes.*

Mr. Archuleta - asked the definition of adjacent; Picuris is off on its own.

Mr. Bird - the project is cutting trees on FS land and subject to the same rules; all tribes would have to be consulted that were listed in the Carson.

Facilitator - the point will be left in.

Ms. Burnett - wanted to ensure strength #1 wasn't taken off the list because of the tribal consultation issue. The proposal included a diverse and balanced group of partners and that the letters sent to tribes was not directly related to #1.

The panel agreed.

Mr. Berrens - suggested on weakness #6 *for treatment on forest service lands.*

The panel decided #6 wouldn't apply; treatment wasn't on FS land.

Mr. Racher - provided recommendation language: *The proposal could have been strengthened by consultation with other tribal entities.*

Facilitator - confirmed that weakness # 6 would be removed and become a recommendation.

Mr. Archuleta - the recommendation meant the panel has to say that everyone should collaborate with other tribes. Even as a recommendation, the applicant would think they have to find another tribe to collaborate with.

Ms. Watson- agreed with Mr. Archuleta that collaboration shouldn't be a requirement. The Picuris partnered with Ohkay Owingeh. The panel should consider the recommendation not be included.

Facilitator - asked for consensus on striking the recommendation.

Ms. Burnett - suggested that the collaboration be removed. The panel agreed there should be consultation.

The recommendation was removed by majority panel agreement.

Mr. Berrens- added strengths # 20 - The application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100% utilization of the generated by-product (slash mulching.)

Strength #29 was added - creates new jobs and strength # 18.

Language from weakness #28 was added: *Distinction between project and previously funded CFRP grant is unclear. There could be more detail about the objectives and results of the 2007 CFRP grant (e.g., text discussion on page 4 is ambiguous on mushroom production and might be inconsistent with the business and marketing plan.)*

Mr. Berrens added another weakness - *Charcoal production in attached business/marketing plan appears limited to the current grant application, while the proposal includes discussion of on-going charcoal activities.*

The Pueblo said they successfully operated the lab but the following sentence said it turned out to be unsuccessful, but it was still in their business plan. The proponent said there was an ongoing charcoal production but the business plan only included the expected production from the current grant being requested. The business plan included no productions other than the 33,000 pounds of charcoal.

Mr. Berrens made a recommendation - *The entity could be helped by collaboration with the Small Business Development Center.*

Mr. Matush –would feel more comfortable if: *The charcoal production attached business/marketing plan seems limited to current grant*- was included in the recommendation. The Picuris couldn't compete with Match Light, etc. and it would be a Pueblo community project.

Panel members disagreed and noted that the Pueblo would market to outside vendors. The panel consensus was the recommendation should be removed.

Ms. Fisher - added strengths #6, 8 and 17.

Mr. Vincent - added strengths # 26, 12, and 13.

Mr. Jervis - asked if there were cross jurisdictional activities. All of it was on tribal land.

Ms. Watson - the Pueblo was working with Ohkay Owingeh on some things; that was cross jurisdictional if they looked at it as tribal.

Mr. Vincent - was okay with #26 being removed.

Ms. Watson - asked on cross jurisdictional activities; what was meant by *activities*. Activities could be any part of the proposal. Each Pueblo was individual and did things differently and what Ohkay Owingeh does could be different than Picuris.

Mr. Dunn - suggested additional language. To him a cross jurisdictional restoration project would be like creating a watershed… and implied treatment on the land.

Ms. Watson - then it should state cross jurisdictional means treatment on the land.

Mr. Payne - the word *activities* could be changed. It could be defined afterwards that the Pueblo would market to the surrounding pueblos.

Mr. Dunn - the panel wasn't bound by what was listed and could say it included business partnerships with other tribes.

Facilitator - suggested alternative language-*The project includes a business partnership with Ohkay Owingeh.*

Mr. Matush - it was okay as a weakness that old and large trees weren't mentioned, but he visited the Picuris Pueblo. He saw them working on the ditch and all of it was PJ (Piñon/Juniper) on the Carson side. The Picuris said they took the large stuff but he didn't see anything that large. He would have a problem with private property owners being told they have to save their larger trees.

Mr. Dunn - they were government not private property.

Mr. Olivas - there was a statement about 9 inch diameter and less.

The panel discussed old and large trees and the proposal statements.

Mr. Archuleta - the proposal states "will thin large and small diameter, 9 inches and smaller" and the distinction between large and small is relative.

Ms. Burnett - it is okay to strike it. Mr. Vincent objected; he wasn't okay with it being struck.

Mr. Jervis - the statement Mr. Archuleta quoted was the definition of a small diameter tree and the proposal states large and small trees would be cut. Small trees were 9 inches and less and he was concerned the proposal doesn't say they *wouldn't* cut large trees.

Mr. Dunn - the language stated to preserve all the large trees because there wasn't a definition of what a large tree was.

Mr. Matush and Ms. Burnett agreed weakness #9 could be struck if the panel chose that.

Mr. Pohlman - wanted to leave weakness #9. The problem was the application was vague on the point and the panel couldn't tell. He couldn't find adherence to New Mexico Forest Restoration principles.

Mr. Cooke - the proposal is for utilization and states it would be cut and another project would do the thinning. He thought the proponent would pull it out and utilize it.

Ms. Burnett - suggested adding language from weakness #10 about the New Mexico Forest Restoration Principles for clarification.

Mr. Racher - another funding would pay for thinning but he was concerned that thinning would be paid for by BIA and the FS would pay for sawyers; that would be paying twice.

Mr. Dunn - agreed it was a weakness and unclear who would pay for what.

Mr. Matush - agreed with Mr. Pohlman and thought the panel should go with what was on the paper.

Mr. Pohlman- suggested an Administrative Observation- *A weakness in the proposal was the need to pay for federal funding.*

Mr. Berrens- the sawyers were paid under this grant to remove and that was a label for the workers reading the budget justification. The $50,000 grant to the BIA/NPA was for the thinning and what was being paid was the biomass.

Facilitator - the statement will be left in Administration.

Mr. Archuleta - the panel should discuss if another grant would pay if the old large trees get preserved.

Mr. Payne- agreed. The question would then be if cut by the thinning and it was down, is there a requirement not to use it.

Mr. Archuleta - the old, large trees are specific to the CFRP fund.

Mr. Dunn – Mr. Peralta (Carson NF) has pointed out that the budget justification for year one stated the Forestry Director would dedicate 605 hours and this would not be federally restricted. The understanding was the salary for the thinning would be part of the nonfederal match for this grant and that will become part of the project.

Mr. Racher - agreed the statement could stay.

Mr. Cooke - provided language for a weakness- *The costs of this project is not reasonable and within the range of fair market value for similar work.* The cost of $3700 per acre for removal was excessive; normal industry costs were around $68,000. The production cost for charcoal was $3.50 per pound meaning a 10 pound bag would cost $35.00. That just included the $220,000, not the $50,000 the tribe would put in or any other match.

Mr. Matush - $3700 was just for the sawyers. He calculated $4200 for the whole project.

Mr. Archuleta - this is utilization and it isn’t about the treatment. The panel should look at the specific budget for the treatment. If the total project cost was used there were a lot more elements than just treatment of the acre.

Mr. Matush - looked at the total cost of the money available on a reimbursement.

Mr. Berrens - the $50,000 was for thinning and then there was removal. The removal costs should be isolated to have a more accurate assessment because of community outreach, the charcoal production, etc.

Mr. Dunn- the panel could look at comparable cost for the treatment; or the charcoal production part of the budget compared to other charcoal production activities; or the training compared to the cost of that type of training.

Mr. Jervis - the point was that the cost of the project wasn't reasonable under the fair market value for similar work. Also the cost of the production of charcoal was high compared to the price being made. That was a weakness in the business plan.

Mr. Matush - that was a moot point; it was overpriced.

Mr. Archuleta - the numbers would justify whether reasonable or unreasonable and it wasn't clear what that was.

Mr. Dunn - the costs of charcoal was very specific.

Mr. Archuleta – asked if the $35 production of charcoal based on the total project number or just the charcoal production portion of the budget.

Mr. Cooke - Mr. Berrens determined the removal was about $1400 and that was excessive.

Mr. Dunn - one problem was the costs were hard to break out and that meant a lack of detail in the business plan and made it difficult to determine if the project costs were reasonable.

Facilitator - this was put as a weakness in those terms. Another was a recommendation on the business plan- *The cost of this project is not reasonable and within the fair market value of similar work. The cost of production for charcoal was high compared to the value that the proposal states it will be sold for and the cost of removal is above industry standards.*

Mr. Jervis - a weakness was that the narrative stated the income on the project would be used for equipment and that was not reflected in the budget and should be. He read language from the proposal: "Revenues from charcoal sales support equipment purchases and maintenance and operations for the charcoal facility." The budget does not reflect that income.

Mr. Dunn - if income occurs during the activity funded by the grant, the income has to go back into the project; or if the income raised the value of the total project (in CFRP's case) above $450,000, the total amount of the grant has to be reduced by that amount of income. Also if the project was audited and income was determined the proponent would be asked for that amount.

Mr. Bird - thought the social value was critical. He looks at the hard cost of salary and equipment when he looks at value and whether someone was paid $80 an hour when the going rate was $40 an hour.

Mr. Jervis - added strength #33 and weakness #30.

Mr. Pohlman - asked if any of the charcoal ovens were purchased with past CFRP contributions.

Mr. Peralta - the ovens were purchased with critical capital outlay from the state.

Mr. Pohlman - added a strength - *The adjacent public land manager provided a letter of support that committed to assistance with public educational programs and safety training for forest workers.*

Mr. Racher - added weakness #13 and 15 and language on 15- *With no estimates of the value of products, specifically latillas and vigas, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business application; further the project itself does not demonstrate that this would lead to a viable business therefore the project wouldn't add significant capacity to the restoration efforts.*

Mr. Archuleta - -suggested #13 should be combined and tie into *the project does not demonstrate*… it wasn't clear that would add significant capacity to the restoration…

Ms. Watson - on the point that there wasn't an estimate of the value of the product, specifically latillas and vigas, the panel has done proposals where actual values weren't given.

Mr. Jervis - the value of the vigas or latillas or the charcoal has to be included if the proponent said they would sell it. The Picuris hasn't put down how much would be made from that.

Ms. Watson - other proposals haven't been as specific on the details. She was just saying the panel should be sure all proponents do that.

Mr. Dunn – some proponents do provide that information and if not, this was a good comment.

Ms. Fisher - on Ms. Watson's point, this wasn't a weakness on Proposal #2 the previous day. That had similar issues and had no figure for what the proponent would sell. They had a lot of buyers interested in the project, like this proposal, but they had no projected income.

Mr. Jervis- that was put as a weakness that the project income was not included.

Mr. Vincent - the weakness can be removed. He added a recommendation - #5... *From the beginning of the development of a restoration project, general estimates of volume of byproduct to be generated (vigas, latillas and firewood) should be made to the purpose of co-developing the utilization strategy.*

Facilitator - clarified the recommendation would state that some proposals have stated costs and others have not. The recommendation was to get proponents to look at this from a business perspective, and there was also a social perspective.

Mr. Racher - added weakness #29 - the proponent had not addressed the panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations.

Ms. Burnett - added a weakness: *the applicant had not included the NEPA Decision Document in the application.*

Mr. Jervis - added recommendations: #12, 13 and 14.

Ms. Fisher - disagreed. The project demonstrates that it could lead to a viable business with business assistance. She would be okay with *the project would not add significant capacity to the restoration project efforts.* The proponent has demonstrated they produce a good product that would successfully sell with good advertisement and assistance.

Mr. Racher - couldn't see where the proposal said the product would be a viable business that wouldn't need continued funding.

Mr. Berrens - to evaluate sustainability and viability is difficult because of the social benefits attached to forest restoration. The Pueblo might be able to create revenues in the future that lower the net cost and live on future public grants for the forest restoration thinning and that would generate benefits in the future.

Mr. Berrens saw no evidence that the Pueblo could make a profit on their own; but larger social benefits attached to restoration, wildfire risks, etc. might mean the FS might want to subsidize the proposal.

His problem was that FS wants lower net costs and the Pueblo hasn't connected with a SBDC to get a marketing plan to understand their costs and what expected revenues would be.

There was a lot of potential but the business/marketing plan made no sense. He would like the Pueblo to determine their costs and revenue in more detail and do a better job accounting for that.

Ms. Fisher - agreed if they were just looking at the grant; however she looked at future potential. She agreed to leave the recommendation in.

Mr. Archuleta- - on criteria #12- "Is the proposed activity a priority area for hazardous fuel reduction-" some proponents mention that in their application.

The panel thought a letter of endorsement should also be included.

Mr. Dunn - in the past an established way to determine that was to say that it was a part of a community protection plan or the state forest and watershed health. There were processes to formally identify that.

Mr. Archuleta - his point was it was part of the FS's business. The FS is more aware of what happens at the state level and he gave the example the previous day that the panel didn't have the input about the Forest Service mission now being a forest watershed health and that a full assessment had been done. Some applicant's might not have that update.

Mr. Dunn - if on tribal land, all that is needed is a letter from the tribe. This proposal also has a letter from the Forest Service and that was where the information would be.

If the FS letter or the proposal doesn't address the subject, the panel could state a weakness that it wasn't clear in the proposal.

Mr. Archuleta - asked for clarity on how to mark #12 as to whether that was a priority. He asked if the New Mexico FWS had a map that shows priorities.

Mr. Payne- it wasn't clear in either the proposal or the letters. There is no way a line officer from the forest would say if that was priority for the tribe and the panel couldn't speak to that if it wasn't in the letter.

Mr. Peralta - reviewed both letters and neither said it was a priority. A lot of proposals reverted to New Mexico Communities at Risk and that was accepted as legitimate.

Mr. Pohlman - it doesn't boost the proposal that it wasn't mentioned but he couldn't say it detracted from the proposal.

Mr. Archuleta - the discussion helped the applicant know the issue was addressed. He suggested language be added- *specifically per criteria #12*.

Mr. Matush - the Picuris don't want to be a national distributor for charcoal; they state that it was a small community and they just want to provide charcoal for the surrounding communities. The charcoal sales revenue wasn't an issue for him because it wasn't the important thing.

Mr. Berrens - the proposal mentions Whole Foods, Trader Joe's and Sunflower Markets.

Facilitator - asked Mr. Matush if he would suggest the revenue from charcoal sales for equipment etc. be taken off.

Mr. Matush –wouldn't argue; it could be taken off.

Mr. Payne - it was important because if the Pueblo sells the product there would be income. The Pueblo should know the income needs to be in the budget and accounted for as program income.

The panel agreed to keep the weakness.

Danny Gomez returned to the room.

Break- 10:13-10:22 a.m.

Review of Applications- CFRP 04-11 and CFRP 05-11 (Continued)
2011 CFRP Grant Proposals: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

CFRP 04-11 – Roger Tucker, Inc.
There was no conflict of interest noted for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 04-11
Organization:	Roger Tucker, Inc.
Forest:	Cibola
Project Title:	Improved Utilization of Small Diameter Trees in Central New Mexico
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Bryan Bird gave the overview on this proposal.

This proposal is a 3 year utilization proposal and is largely an equipment purchase for a mobile de-limber, de-barker and grinder for in the woods processing. The proponent proposed to produce clean chip free of bark, stone and soil and of a higher value. Some markets were established: playground safety surfaces, wood biomass and include the Santa Fe Community College, Titan Construction, landscape erosion control and animal bedding. Sales have been made in Bernalillo and the project proposed to create two new jobs.

Roger Tucker Inc., the proponent has 42 years of experience in the industry and in mechanical expertise. The proponent has met with collaborators. Utilization would include the purchase of two pieces of small diameter tree processing equipment and the placement of the equipment on selected existing forest restoration hazardous fuel reduction projects, as determined by the FS and the monitoring team. This adds value to small diameter trees by producing valuable viable product; establishing working relations with the collaborative partners for mutual support, profitability, job creation and self sustaining forest restoration and keeping the equipment in use and maximizing the acreage by ensuring there was a ready forest restoration fuels reduction project and raw materials.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush - added strengths #1-3, 7, 12, 13, 16, 18-20, and 10.

Mr. Olivas - added strengths- # 6, 29, 23.

Mr. Olivas - this proposal was a utilization proposal and ecological monitoring wasn't applicable. The applicant (Roger Tucker) was asked on the monitoring and evaluation plan on page 9, if his statement meant he would not evaluate the ecological conditions of his proposal.

Mr. Tucker- that was stated because he was buying equipment and treatment wasn't being done.

Ian Fox, Cibola NF&G - the proposal requested funding for equipment that would increase acreage treated on the FS but not specifically an implementation proposal. The proponent is targeting the socio-economic monitoring aspect versus the ecological, since the proposal wasn't funding any of that.

Mr. Jervis- added weaknesses #8, 16 and 33. The panel commented that acres were not actually being treated on #8. Mr. Jervis agreed to omit the weakness.

He added recommendation #12.

Mr. Racher- disagreed; the proponent wasn't actually removing trees except from areas already treated.

Mr. Bird- added weaknesses #3, (criteria 9) the proposal basically stated there would be field trips and "feel good" type things but YCC or other groups were not involved.

Mr. Archuleta - because this was utilization, youth wouldn't be involved in the work component. The project is unique in that it tried to include learning and an educational process for kids and that is a strength.

Mr. Bird- he was willing to move the strength to a recommendation. Mr. Archuleta agreed.

Mr. Bird added weakness #4 (criteria 5); he didn't see a letter from the National Wild Turkey Foundation. Ms. Burnett agreed.

Mr. Bird- there isn't a conservation group and if someone wanted to argue that point it could go under Administration.

Mr. Dunn- the requirement was *a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders*.

Facilitator- the weakness #4 was added under recommendation.

Mr. Vincent- those aspects were up to the FS; they provided this as industry. He doesn't think the protection of wildlife would be up to the proponent. This was more to the supply side of the timber.

Mr. Dunn- it would not be up to FS. The statutory for this program states to include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders; that is a requirement.

Mr. Archuleta- it is the stakeholder taken into account but not necessarily an activity of the area. The question was what the weight of that is. On the utilization end of it, what is the major role the conservation group would play in actually turning the small diameter ratio product?

Facilitator - asked if weakness #4 should be left in recommendations.

Mr. Bird- they were listed in the table and monitoring. He thought it a weakness.

Ms. Burnett- the proponent had called out the National Wild Turkey Federation in the proposal so it wasn't as if the proponent decided because this was utilization they wouldn't need to prove…

Mr. Dunn - if the partners have roles in the project, the RFA requires a letter in the appendix from the project partner that stated they agreed to do that.

Mr. Bird - couldn't find a letter. He wanted to keep the item a weakness.

Mr. Racher – agreed, the letter wasn't there.

Mr. Vincent- added strengths #22 and 24.

Ms. Burnett - added a strength - *A strong endorsement letter from the National Forest with detailed commitments provided.*

Mr. Pohlman - added a strength- *An endorsement from the Forest Supervisor of the Cibola NF recognizing the fourfold increase in product demand and commits to support that demand with an*

environmental analysis and commits staff to participate in monitoring, outreach and educational efforts.

Ms. Watson - on strength #6- NEPA is complete…there is no NEPA documentation with the proposal. On page 5 it states the project would already have a requirement completed and approved.

Clarification of the proponent was asked. If that was not approved; had it been signed off; where was the documentation.

Ian Fox, Cibola NF&G - apparently the proponent was getting material from the Thunderbird EA which is NEPA. The proponent thought there wouldn't be need to put a Decision Memo into the appendix.

Ms. Watson - the proposal says in the beginning it was approved and then on page 5 said something else. It wasn't clear where the areas were.

She made a recommendation- *The proponent should provide a more detailed project map indicating NEPA ready areas for the removal.*

Mr. Archuleta - the problem on the NEPA issue as a strength was it was boiler plate. He suggested language-*The proponent will be pulling product from a NEPA cleared area.*

Facilitator - the #6 language was added - *The proponent would be utilizing material pulled from NEPA cleared areas.*

Mr. Matush- the education is a strength to him, with all of the projects the proponent has. To take kids to a saw mill was a completely different type of education and important to the industry. He thought that Mr. Bird thought it was a recommendation.

Facilitator - reviewed the recommendation and the panel agreed it would remain.

Mr. Matush - currently 3500 kids were in the field and to open the mill on this proposal would be positive. He suggested it be a strength because it was unusual to see kids around learning equipment.

Mr. Dunn- read from the statute on youth involvement as criteria. The statute asked if the project would create local employment and training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives and include summer youth job programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps, where appropriate. It couldn't be a weakness but it *could* be a strength.

The only place that youth matters were mentioned was "and include summer job programs such as …" The program has evolved to support different environmental educational activities, which is okay as extra strength items but it would be a mistake to ding a project because they don't have a youth outreach. It isn't a requirement.

Mr. Bird - agreed to remove the statement but if the panel thought it should be a strength he wanted to hear why. He wanted to see that it was more than an afterthought and to see Highlands to do a business plan for thesis in the utilization project.

Mr. Matush - it was an afterthought. It was a positive to him that the kids were learning the equipment side.

Mr. Vincent - there were a lot of things kids could do that wouldn't mean running the equipment; it was part of monitoring.

Ms. Fisher - the Tara School letter said in the past relationship they enjoyed the wood that was donated and teaching the kids sustainability.

The item was taken out of Recommendations and added to Strengths.

Mr. Dunn - Mr. Matush's point was a good one as to why it was a strength.

The language would include that the youth component included exposure to equipment and the utilization side of forest restorations.

Mr. Archuleta - added strength #8 (criteria 8) - *The project promotes the preservation of large diameter trees by creating a viable market for small diameter trees.* This creates an incentive to go after small trees.

Mr. Archuleta - asked the FS for clarification on criteria 12; would the material for that project be pulled from areas that are priority for hazardous fuel reduction.

Mr. Fox, FS - currently the purchased materials came from the Manzano Mountains; the highest priority area identified in the Torrance County CWPP. The new area would be NEPA approved by the end of the month and was within the same high priority CWPP area.

Mr. Jervis - that could be a strength if the proponent created a viable market. It wasn't a strength that it promotes the preservation of larger trees and isn't clear to him how creating a market for small diameter trees would do that. He was concerned about the connection between the two things.

Mr. Jervis suggested it was a strength the project creates a market for small diameter trees.

Mr. Dunn - asked the FS for clarification.

Mr. Fox - it was not as detailed in the proposal as the panel would like, but he could say on current NEPA being implemented, all prescriptions have a 15 inch prescriptive diameter limit. The new NEPA has been scoped and states that no trees would be cut over 16 inches DPH. By NEPA default, it was built-in to protect what was considered large trees based on the New Mexico Forest Restoration principals.

Mr. Jervis - questions the connection.

Mr. Vincent - this is utilization; the forest industry will help treat large areas of forest in which large trees would be kept; not decide who cuts what. The forest managers would decide that. There was a direct connection; the more viable the forest industry is to provide a market for small trees, the larger areas that would be treated and therefore the more large trees they would save.

Mr. Vincent - agreed to leave as it was.

Mr. Matush - Mr. Jervis's point was correct but one sentence on the bottom of page 5: "the project would enhance the ability to significantly increase capacity to complete forest restoration" was where Mr. Vincent's point was correct.

He agreed with Mr. Vincent that the industry could cure some of the restoration problems because it has a market and product. Most of what the panel discusses doesn't have viable product.

Mr. Jervis - nothing in the proposal responds to creating a market for small diameter trees. Because there was a market for chips doesn't mean it couldn't use old trees.

Mr. Archuleta- his point was that if the market was created for small diameter, the indirect effect was that they wouldn't go after the big trees. He put that in to tie back to #13 but was okay if they took it that larger trees are preserved.

Mr. Payne- confirmed criteria 8 would be removed.

Mr. Gomez- questioned the proponent- on page 5 it states an important objective was to treat more acres of overstock fire prone forests. He asked how that would be accomplished if the proposal was just to buy equipment.

Mr. Tucker- there is a bigger demand for chips and a bigger demand for clean chips. The machinery has the capacity for larger production; one load equals 1 acre. Last year he used 380 truck loads and this year he would easily use five times that amount but couldn't process that much with his current equipment.

Mr. Gomez - couldn't see where the proponent identified acres on the ground.

Mr. Tucker - the timber has to be removed from the forest and once removed something has to be done with it.

Mr. Gomez- asked who would cut the trees and would they then remove it.

Mr. Tucker- many operators would cut the trees. He would just utilize the wood in the decks in the forest which creates more demand.

Mr. Fox - the proponent needs more material and that means more acres from Forest Service. The proponent worked with a combination of various operators and contracts. FS put material in decks and the proponent purchased some; some of the future work would be subbed out with logging companies to harvest and provide material.

This equipment allows the trees to be processed for the product that could be sold in a more efficient manner and meet customer market demands. By default the proponent would need more material, which means more acres would be treated. The proponent will go from 400 to 1200 acres a year, plus being treated.

Mr. Gomez- understood that but he wasn't sure which acres were under contract to be thinned.

Mr. Fox – areas within the zone on the map; all over the Cibola National Forest.

Mr. Racher - hadn’t recused himself for that reason. They have a number of contracts on the forest where they were paid to cut, skid and deck material. Mr. Tucker was buying the material. He cut the wood and the forest sold the wood to Mr. Tucker.

Mr. Gomez – a recommendation would be that he would like to see areas on the forest being thinned and the wood being decked and available for Roger’s machinery to supply his business. He said the statement (Roger’s) said it was an important objective.

Mr. Dunn- suggested a recommendation based on Mr. Gomez’s point- *The proposal would be strengthened if the connection between increased capacity for utilization and its effect on more acres treated were more clearly described.*

Mr. Fox - that was addressed in the letter of support signed by Nancy Rhodes; collaborative work would be done on 300 acres with the proponent and the new capacity would increase that to 1200 acres. That dovetailed with the reason FS supported the project; FS would move into a 40,000 acre project in the Sandia and wouldn't be able to do the project without someone taking the material. The letter (page 5) explained in detail where the project was presently and why the proponent was so important to the future.

Mr. Gomez - the letter does address that but it doesn't tie into the proposal.

Mr. Dunn- suggested language - *The proposal would be strengthened if the connection between increased processing capacity increases the number of acres the forest anticipates treating.*

Mr. Gomez - agreed that was the point he wanted to make.

Mr. Vincent - the recommendation should be removed; it was a logical relationship. The better the market for small dimension timber the more acres would be treated; that's a fact.

Facilitator- this statement was in Recommendations and the letter from the FS was clear on what was being done. She asked what the panel wanted to do.

Mr. Pohlman- could evaluate the proposal without knowing that. This is a critical piece. In the past you could only sell small diameter to tiny niche markets and several acres a year could be treated that way. This meant that you could treat many more timbers in that acreage. He thought it has implication for the preservation of old trees.

He disagreed with Tom. Converting operations to handle small diameter timber meant that you could sell small stuff and no longer have to mark big stuff to make sales.

Mr. Gomez - loggers were there and he wasn't sure if they would take it for their own needs or utilizing the proponent's equipment. There was no correlation between the supplier and what was being done with it.

Mr. Dunn - when a recommendation, weakness or strength was made, it wasn't just to speak to the current applicant but for all future applicants. It would be an advantage to proposals and elsewhere to clearly make the connection in a proposal as well as in an endorsement.

Mr. Payne - Cibola has a unique approach in the way this was being done. In these areas felling and skidding was contracted and comes with deck and the project was finished. They would then sell the material. A separate contractor would do the felling etc. and the decks would be sold.

Mr. Vincent - the timber marking designation of what would be cut is done by the forest owners/forest managers. The better the contractors have to get stuff out the better the forest could be treated and it gave more flexibility.

Facilitator - asked the panel if this should be left as a recommendation that it was important to make that connection, for future applicants.

Mr. Jervis - #12 was referred to and on page 4 the proposal referred to skidding trees in order to chip; so there is ground disturbance in this proposal.

Mr. Fox - asked clarification as to whether the skidding was *at* the landing or to the landing. Currently whole tree skidding to the landing was what was being done and was through the other contracts. The reference was to describe how the equipment that was purchased would be used through the proposal.

Mr. Jervis- was still concerned.

Mr. Vincent - on the skidding part of the logging operation, timber removal; the restrictions would be put on by the land managers and not the timber companies. That was on the forest manager's side.

Mr. Jervis - doesn't think the FS should wash its hands of the whole affair. He wanted the recommendation to remain.

Mr. Archuleta - remembered discussing the issue the previous day and the panel had decided not to make a recommendation because it put a requirement on the proponent.

Mr. Dunn - when there is a revised product proposal, the proponent has to submit in the appendix a description of the how the weaknesses and recommendations from the prior panel were addressed. On a weakness the proponent has to modify but on recommendations, a case could be made that it wouldn't make sense in their situation.

Ms. San Gil- that was not just on a revised proposal. If this application were to be funded, before it could go forward the applicant would have to address the recommendations in writing to the FS. If the panel left that in, there had to be an acknowledgment.

Mr. Archuleta - that was his point- this puts something on the proponent and would have to be on every utilization project. This proponent wouldn't have a part in the ground disturbing activities, he was just purchasing materials.

Mr. Dunn - the other point is you could only tell the grant applicant to do things that were within their purview of what they proposed to do with their funding.

Mr. Jervis - asked to pull the recommendation.

Mr. Racher - added a strength- *This project accomplished goals beyond the CFRP funding available; they had not asked for salaries and this was utilization and capacity that if the panel granted the proposal the proponent would pay for the salaries and the operation could sustain that.*

He added another strength- *The project provides for sustainable utilization beyond the life of the CFRP grant and contributes to long term management.*

The emphasis was on the integrative landscape (meaning letters from Cibola and Santa Fe National Forest and Santa Fe National Forest.)

The Panel developed language- *The potential utilization from two national forests adjacent land grants facilitates integrative landscape restoration (criteria 11.)*

Mr. Dunn - regarding weakness #16- the executive summary on page 1 in the first paragraph, third objective was that it would create restoration based employment and improve forest worker safety. He suggested the weakness be removed.

Weakness #16 was removed.

Mr. Dunn – weakness #33 in the case where equipment was being purchased and other things were paid for by the applicant, should be a recommendation. He provided language- *If there is program income as part of the project, it should be reflected in the budget.*

Weakness #33 was put under Recommendation.

Mr. Cooke - on strength #10 - because logs were taken out of the woods doesn't prevent a catastrophic wildfire. He suggested it be taken out of strengths.

Mr. Matush - the reason he said that was because the panel considered a lot of cord wood proposals that couldn't make a dent in high density areas. A high-end product, such as this proposal, has a higher chance to reduce the risk.

Mr. Cooke - unless it was part of the bigger landscape that reduced spatial trees and ladders, etc. it wouldn't prevent a catastrophic wild fire.

Mr. Matush - the panel has only received a few projects that could come close to reducing the risks; that was the prescription that the FS required.

Ms. Watson - there was the aspect of restoration that has to be done to sustain the forest for high intensity fires. This proposal doesn't do that; it just takes trees from the forest.

Mr. Vincent – that was part of planning and is what the FS specified in forest treatment. It contributes to making the forest healthier through thinning and fuel reduction, etc.

Mr. Matush - saw nothing different in any of the thinning projects in the 35 proposals; the forest required the prescription and it was to reduce catastrophic wild fire. True restoration has to start with thinning and then it was up to the FS. It was the closest proposal he has seen that could come close to reducing the risk.

Mr. Archuleta - suggested language - *The project will promote the reduction of and risk of, high intensity wildfire by creating a market for small diameter timber. Leaving the downed material increases the potential for catastrophic wildfire.*

Mr. Cooke - agreed it was a project positive if something was said about fuel being removed from the forest, but still doesn't apply to reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire.

Facilitator - the language Mr. Archuleta suggested was added - *This project will promote the reduction of small diameter material and contribute to reducing the fuels thus lowering the risk of high intensity wildfire.*

Mr. Vincent - the statement should stay because there is a sustainable economic market for small timber that would reflect on the FS's ability to designate trees for removal and thinning, that it otherwise couldn't.

Mr. Cooke – agreed with the statement.

Mr. Gomez – suggested: *reduces the amount of fuel that has been thinned from the forest.*

Ms. San Gil read the new statement - *This project will promote the reduction of small diameter material and contribute to reducing the fuels that have been thinned on the forest.*

Mr. Vincent - that separates thinning from taking this stuff out; it was all one operation. What was to be thinned was marked. He asked "**that have been thinned**" be taken out because it was all part of thinning; it was part of removing.

Mr. Dunn - thinning was not necessarily removing.

Mr. Matush - the language should be simple. This statement might have to be used on every proposal. He hasn't seen a proposal where there was 100% utilization of all downed material. He agreed with Mr. Vincent, the project would reduce the risk and that's all they could go on.

Facilitator - read the new language- *This project will promote the reduction of small diameter material and contribute to reducing the fuels.*

Mr. Matush - suggested the panel keep the original "*reducing the risk of high intensity wildfire*."

Ms. Burnett – this was where the score sheet would come into play and the panel always had to agree on the rating on issues.

Mr. Matush - on every thinning project he thought the panel went back to the premise of the CFRP and it tended to show as a strength on almost every thinning project. He agreed with the way the statement read.

Mr. Berrens - provided language for a strength- *This utilization proposal includes strong focus on socio-economic monitoring, with potential for long term monitoring of a restoration based business.* He added that while the act doesn't specifically require socio-economic long-term monitoring, he thought everyone would be interested in that. This was offered as a potential for consideration and the proponent should be commended for that and be taken up on it.

Ms. Fisher - provided language for a strength- *The proponent included proof of letters sent to tribes.*

CFRP 05-11 – Tree New Mexico
There was no conflict of interest for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 05-11
Organization:	Tree New Mexico
Forest:	Cibola
Project Title:	Building a Sustainable Ecological and Economic Wood Product Cycle in the Albuquerque Bosque
Funding Requested:	$321,292
Matching Funds:	$233,300/ $87,092
Total Budget:	$439,965

Coleman Burnett provided the proposal overview.

The total amount requested was $321,292 and the federal share was $233,300 and the non federal share was $87,092 and included nonfederal match provided by the City of Albuquerque Open Space Division, Tree New Mexico and Southwest Youth Services (SYS). Other partners were the Pueblo of Santa Ana, the Santa Ana Nursery, the New Mexico Forestry Division, New Mexico State University, the Open Space Division and Forest Guild.

The proposal is a utilization proposal for restored and burned areas within the Albuquerque Bosque. At least 500 acres of available, damaged and invasive species would be targeted for waste wood removal. A small portable mill would be purchased with CFRP grant funds. The project was for three years with year one milestones and would include a computer and software to be used in the field to identify sites for wood removal. Trees would be marked and timber made for the woodlot. Marketing, advertising and monitoring would take place and TNM would purchase a table saw, a chain saw and safety gear for working with small diameter timber. Restoration of 300 acres would begin within designated areas of the Bosque.

In years two and three the full-scale implementation of the milling operation includes large diameter trees marked due to damage. Funds generated from the sale of harvested wood would go to the Woodward Nursery Fund and further the Bosque restoration. Wood would be marketed to furniture artwork and other boutique uses.

TNM would work with SYS and the NACA to complete restoration activities within the 300 acres within the Bosque. NEPA restoration activities would include planting cottonwood, willow poles and native trees and shrubs, grasses and wild flowers.

The project would build from accomplishments made through CFRP grants received in 2002 and 2007. Ms. Burnett said she was unsure if the CFRP grants were received directly or through partners. The monitoring plan doesn't include the CFRP core indicators but she felt that was due to the riparian monitoring activities. The socio-economic indicators were listed in the monitoring plan.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 20. Also strength- A business plan was outlined in the proposal and the proponent plans to develop a business plan.

Mr. Gomez added strength - *Good legible maps*. And a recommendation - *The proposal would've been strengthened by identifying how the Wood-Mizer would be utilized.*

Mr. Matush - has a hard time with the strength that the project would reduce the risk of high intensity wildfire on the Bosque. That was impossible. He has visited sites in the open space in the Bosque were the cottonwoods were cleared and a lot of debris was on the ground and there was no way to stop the fire; the open space division would not allow removal of volumes of trees.

Mr. Dunn - asked for clarification from the applicant.

FS - in the big burn in April 2009 south of the Hispanic Cultural Center a lot of wood was removed and was being sold. Large stumps and full logs were being separated to address the concerns. Some areas were left with huge amounts of debris and this proposal addresses that.

Mr. Matush - suggested a change in language- *There could be potential reduction.* The fire risk on the Bosque was much higher.

Facilitator - asked that *potentially* be added to the language.

Mr. Jervis - Bandolier burned their Bosque every three years to keep it down and the proponent could get to that point if they burned regularly.

Mr. Matush - the City of Albuquerque oversees the Bosque management and they were prepared to do that.

Unknown gentleman –oversees the Bosque management program and the scale and magnitude and intensity of fires now was vastly different than a few years ago and was a matter of scale. They constantly adjusted the fuel loads.

The language was changed to- *The project could potentially reduce the risk of high intensity wild fires.*

Mr. Matush - asked the open space representative regarding the ERDAS 1500 software- who would work with the software. No one was mentioned in the project with that software expertise.

Gail Probart- Steven Ryan and the forester listed in the budget would work with the software. The forester with open space was on staff; the forester listed under personnel was a hired consultant and both would use the software and work as a team for much of the initial work.

Mr. Matush - made a recommendation-*The proposal would have been strengthened if the description of personnel showed their expertise with the software requested.*

Mr. Matush added an additional recommendation - *The proposal would have been strengthened by verification of the marketable products to be produced*. There was no letter of support. He thought the budget for personnel was hefty considering the total.

Ms. Burnett- added a weakness-*The letter from Beth Rekow does not confirm the cost request in the budget.* She added weakness #16 - no reference was found in the proposal that said they assured the safety of operators.

Mr. Olivas - suggested the weakness be removed. The budget justification for the first year stated that it would also be used for safety training.

Ms. Burnett - agreed the weakness could be removed.

Mr. Jervis - added strengths - #22, 23 and 24 and weaknesses: #3, 10, 15, 17, 18, 28 and 33.

Ms. Burnett - on weakness #3 - youth component lacks detail. The letter from SYS provided detail about what would be done in addition to the narrative (page 6 at the bottom) The narrative referred to providing jobs and training and work with NACA, Vista and AmeriCorps projects through SYS. The letter from SYS referred to 40 students that would participate in part- timber forest restoration and fire reduction service projects. She understood the proponent would also do training with small diameter timber utilization as well.

Mr. Jervis - agreed to strike weakness #3.

Facilitator - asked Mr. Jervis for detail on #15.

Mr. Jervis - there wasn't much detail about what would be sold and what the market was.

Mr. Racher - detail on weakness #18 - the amount of material to be removed wasn't clear.

Mr. Dunn - on weakness #17 and 18 - the executive summary stated out of 2500 acres that 7 were identified with volume estimates of approximately 710,004 feet.

Weakness #17 and #18 were removed.

Mr. Jervis - added recommendations #12 and 13.

Ms. Watson - on weakness #10 there was no discussion of the ecological role of fire; that wasn't discussed by a lot of the proposals.

Mr. Racher - the Bosque project recognized they have a historic disturbance regime but it wasn't fire, it was flood. Many times the panel had not allowed them to discuss the historic or ecological role of fire.

Mr. Matush - it might have been the point was glaring because the Bosque was ecologically sensitive. Normally it would be included.

Ms. Watson - was okay with leaving the weakness in but wanted to make the point that a lot of the proposals haven't discussed ecological fire and forest management.

Mr. Berrens - in several proposals that was discussed more in the NEPA. *A specific detail is there isn't enough detail of the products that would be made or the markets that might be available.*

Mr. Dunn - regarding weakness #15 - the second objective in the executive summary on page one was a development of the business plan and states *a business and marketing plan for the sale of wood product, wood timber sales and for specialty boutique wood furniture* etc. Given that, he asked if weakness #15 should be there.

Mr. Matush - this is the second year the proposal has been submitted and he remembered this was discussed with the project the previous year. Nothing in the proposal stated they would try to market boutique woods and there should be an indication of a viable market.

Mr. Jervis- the proposal was the proponents third CFRP and they were finally thinking about a business plan and there wasn't much detail.

Mr. Payne - the statement was that there was no way to validate the viability. Developing a business plan later would still be hard for them to determine the viability.

Mr. Matush - the same statement was made about the Picuris. The proposal was to bring marketability to wood and nothing made him think there was potential. Page 5 at the bottom under project title, stated that the long-term success depended on the continued support of funds generated by the sustainable waste wood program. He thought that a weakness.

Mr. Vincent - added strengths #15 and 17.

Mr. Gomez - confirmed with the proponent (appendix G) that seven areas would be treated and totaled 513 acres. Then the FONSI was 121 acres. He asked if a FONSI was missing.

FS - additional compliance was done by the USACE and it was greater.

Mr. Gomez - asked why the additional FONSI was not included in the packet.

FS- There are two FONSIs - one was 121 acres from Route 66; the second was for the Bosque wildfire project and doesn't list the acreage.

Mr. Gomez - added a Recommendation - *Since the project does not list the acres in the FONSI for the Bosque wildfire project, it would have been helpful to include that in the letter from the City of Albuquerque, identifying the treatment areas/acres.*

Mr. Racher - the proposal doesn't follow the budget format and doesn't have contractual or other costs. An education outreach component was listed and he wasn't sure if that would fund personnel or open space or the contractor.

Ms. San Gil- showed the Administrative statement regarding the budget format.

Mr. Dunn - if the panel thought information should be there, that would be a weakness. The proponent couldn't be required to follow the budget format.

Mr. Racher - agreed the Administrative statement includes the specifics.

Ms. Fisher - asked the proponent if the Woodward Nursery referred to in CFRP grants 2002 and 2007 was also owned by the proponent.

Gail Probart - the Woodward Nursery was established with the 2007 grant and both grants (2002 & 2007) were focused on restoration activities. There were small wood projects on a small scale mostly done by the youth. The activity wasn't anything of the scale moved toward in this proposal.

The Woodward Nursery is on open space land in the Candelaria Preserve. The operation was a joint partnership between TNM and the Open Space Division with the City of Albuquerque. The nursery is technically owned by the City of Albuquerque but the proponent has a partnership agreement with the city to manage the nursery and funding was under TNM. The 2002 grant was a TNM in partnership with Open Space Division.

Ms. San Gil- clarified that TNM was a nonprofit organization that has partnerships with FS in the state to do urban forestry work.

Mr. Olivas - added strengths #6 but asked for clarification from the proponent. Page 4 stated NEPA was completed by the USACE for many areas in the Rio Grande Valley and he asked if that would encompass this.

FS representative - all of the areas shown in the detailed maps were the areas with NEPA EAs done by the USACE. The FONSI inadvertently failed to summarize the acreage.

Mr. Olivas - added strengths #29 - would create new jobs. The proponent mentioned approximately 30 part-time jobs (on page 2) and in the executive summary it mentioned up to 35 youth would be employed. He recommended the actual number of jobs be clarified or be consistent.

Gail Probart - explained the NACA program had 35 youth openings but varied depending on whether kids dropped out or there were not enough good applications received, etc. The reason the component for job skill training was added was because many of the youth were getting older and had requested to continue with the program but there was nothing for them. This proposal moved toward that.

Mr. Olivas - would like to leave the recommendation to provide more clarification.

He added strengths #33.

Ms. Burnett – made a recommendation - *The ecological indicators should be explained for restoration activities.* The monitoring was vague and doesn't include CFRPs core indicators; more detail should be provided.

Ms. Watson - the Bosque projects were different then the FS. She asked Mr. Dunn if the program was still making progress on putting together a monitoring plan on Bosque indicators.

Mr. Dunn - yes the New Mexico Forest Restoration has a draft of core indicators for the Bosque that would come up in the subcommittee meetings. It had been discussed that the current core ecological indicators were insufficient for what was being done in the Bosque.

Ms. Burnett - would feel more comfortable if the applicant stated the core indicators were not a good fit for the project and provided what they would monitor instead. She wasn’t sure what matrix would be monitored.

Mr. Dunn - that it wasn't clear what matrix would be monitored was a good statement.

Ms. Burnett - that should be kept in mind for other riparian projects. The recommendation language should be: *The ecological indicators should be developed for restoration activities.* The panel should know what would be monitored like anyone else.

Mr. Olivas - Monitoring and Evaluation states that the desired ecological condition is a restoration of a healthy and balanced ecosystem… this renewed ecosystem should include flourishing stands of native trees.

Ms. Burnett - that was the *desired* condition. Everyone should explain what they would measure in the field and the proposal doesn't give that.

Mr. Dunn –understood there wouldn't be new cutting and the proponent would just harvest.

Ms. Burnett - up to 300 acres was available for restoration plantings including cottonwoods, willows and other native grasses and forbs.

Ms. San Gil- there was a core indicator - they have to measure survival.

Mr. Matush - it also states small diameter trees would need to be thinned or cleared and went into the non-natives that would be cleared.

Ms. Burnett - the third column states the metric that would be collected that would back up the other two columns.

Mr. Dunn - the RFA (page 14) states that projects which add vegetation must include core indicators, mortality or survival of all species.

Mr. Pohlman - added a strength - *There is a letter of support from the adjacent national forest.*

He also added strength #28.

He didn't specifically see preservation of older large trees and that had been added as a strength. He suggested that be removed and thought the project actually cut a lot of larger trees.

Mr. Olivas - as a recommendation - *There should be page numbers*. Recommendation #16, (page 7) under scientific basis for proposed biological restoration stated: "sustain and enhance the existing cottonwood community's old and large trees."

Mr. Pohlman - the proposal stated specifically some of that would be cut. He wanted the recommendation to stay.

Mr. Matush - the proposal mentions large or damaged trees for salvage, cutting or non-native species.

Mr. Jervis –thought *damaged trees* meant standing dead snags which were 1) important to the ecological health of the area and 2) not much of a fire hazard. He suggested the recommendation be removed.

Ms. Fisher - asked that strength #24; the *application is clear and concise, be removed*.

Facilitator - the panel agreed and it was removed.

Mr. Olivas - on replanting trees on page 9, the open space was necessary to provide annual nursery expenses and to open and prepare the area to replant. He asked if the proposal stated the proponent would replant.

Ms. Burnett - confirmed they would replant (top of page 3.)

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

Review of Applications- CFRP 07-11, CFRB 08-11, CFRB 09-11 Rev. 1
2011 CFRP Grant Proposals: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

CFRP 07-11 – New Mexico Forest Restoration Products
There were no conflict of interest statements for proposal CFRP 07-11

Project Number:	CFRP 07-11
Organization:	New Mexico Forest Restoration Products
Forest:	Cibola
Project Title:	Equipment Purchase for Forest Restoration in Socorro County
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Dick Cooke provided the overview of the proposal.

This proposal is primarily for expansion and was submitted by Carl Livingston who has 20 years in logging. The company wants to buy equipment to expand the business because he has only been able to fill about one third of his orders. The equipment needed is a log loader, a skidder and sawmill; the proponent would pay for half of the sawmill and the program would pay for half. The proponent would provide a forklift and wants the program to buy a pole feeder. A market exists for the products; firewood, pellets and lumber. The proponent has support from the Alamo School Board, the Magdalena FFA, the Apache Creek 4-H, the Mount Taylor Mill Works and Forest Guild would provide safety training and some monitoring.

Letters of support are provided from the New Mexico Forestry, the Cibola National Forest. The projects proposed have NEPA. The Alamo School Board has areas to work in and the proponent proposed to take some of the ground wood from those areas for lumber.

The Alamo School Board in their letter of support stated they produced firewood but did not give a commitment to Mr. Livingston regarding ground logs. The Forest Guild was mentioned in planning and monitoring, but a letter was not included in the packet.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Racher- added strengths #3, 6, 12, and 29 and weaknesses #8, 9, 25, and 32 and a weakness- Fringe benefits were listed under other costs.

Facilitator - the weakness for fringe benefits was listed under Administrative Observations and wasn't needed under Weakness.

Mr. Jervis - added strengths #17, 18, and 19 and weaknesses #1 (doesn't describe what would be accomplished in forest restoration), 12, 33 and 34.

Ms. Burnett - added weakness #2 (doesn't demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups) and #5, (a letter from Forest Guild was not included.) The proposal said that the Forest Guild would be contracted to train two crew members during year one of each grant cycle.

Mr. Racher - asked for clarification from the proponent if the training was certification training that was discussed and listed by the Forest Guild.

Mr. Livingston - contacted the Alamo School Board who contracted Forest Guild to do the supplement training. He called the gentleman from the Forest Guild and was told he was willing to do the training. Mr. Livingston was concerned with the timing and that he would not hire a rookie log cutter.

Mr. Racher –training was the Forest Guild forestry training and generally a letter isn't needed. This is a safety training program available statewide and all of the proponents haven't been asked to get a letter from the Forest Industry Association that training would be provided.

Ms. Burnett – what about the monitoring costs. The Forest Guild letter triggers a lot of things; they were the conservation group as defined by the RFA and that wasn't included. Also Forest Guild may or may not be part of the training but they were a part of the monitoring and $6,000 cost with that was not explained in the letter.

Facilitator - the monitoring is separate.

Ms. Burnett - asked that the first sentence be removed.

It was suggested that either #2 or #5 should be removed.

Ms. Burnett – the Forest Guild is acting in many roles in this proposal; a conservation group, training and monitoring and that is a lot to bear without a commitment letter.

Facilitator - #2 and #5 were left in.

Ms. Burnett - added weakness #21(the application lacks a detailed work plan.) She wanted to see a timeline of the milestones that would be accomplished by a certain date.

Facilitator - confirmed a timeline and milestones would be added.

Mr. Dunn - regarding weakness #33 (program income) – that was a recommendation in the last proposal and that should consistently be a recommendation and not a weakness. That needs to be in a lot of proposals and on the programmatic side, the panel hasn't provided as much guidance as they could.

Mr. Dunn provided language for a recommendation - If there will be program income related to the federal grant, that income has to be reflected in the final budget.

On weakness #34 (core ecological indicators) - this proposal doesn't include treatment. Only the things that would be done that were funded should be monitored. This isn't a weakness if they aren't proposing treatment.

Weakness # 34 was removed.

Mr. Dunn - page 6 at the bottom of the first paragraph stated that the proponent had visited with conservation groups to assist them and helps monitor any and all improvements in those areas. The proponent has demonstrated collaboration with conservation groups. He suggested language- The proposal mentions visiting with conservation groups (page 6, paragraph 1) however no letters of support were in the appendix that identified which conservation groups.

Mr. Dunn – added a weakness (page 6, paragraph 1) - The application states "if harvesting on private lands…

Mr. Payne- noted it was already under Administrative Observations and not in Weakness.

Mr. Gomez - added strength and language- Proposal builds on expanding and existing industry.

He added a weakness - Poor quality maps with no legends.

He added a recommendation - The letter of support from the FS Supervisor references CFRP proposal as (CFRP utilization) not the equipment purchase for forest restoration in Socorro County. It doesn't specifically mention this proposal.

Mr. Bird - it was discussed that the proponent had not mentioned old and large trees but as a point of information, on page 5 of marketing, the proponent stated that his material averaged 9 to 12 inches and that was small trees. A weakness #19 (criteria 6) was added. There really wasn't a monitoring plan.

Mr. Olivas - on page 2 it stated any monitoring to be done on the project would be filled by the district. He agreed with Mr. Bird.

Mr. Berrens- proposed a recommendation in addition to the weakness - Applicant should be commended for proposing a project that integrates treatments and utilization of small diameter trees. They should be encouraged to develop more detailed work plans, extended partnerships and detailed multi- party monitoring plans.

The core architecture idea was there and it was fine to purchase capital assets to extend the small business but there wasn't a detailed work plan. The partnership with the Forest Guild was critical and should be more developed and more detail was needed on the multi-party monitoring plan. He encouraged the proponent to get that information.

Mr. Cooke - Nancy Rhodes, the Forest Supervisor spoke to the commitment of support and multi-party monitoring. She also stated she would help with the youth component of the plan. He added a strength for the letter of support - The application includes a letter of endorsement from the forest supervisor for multi-party monitoring and the youth activities.

Ms. Burnett - added a recommendation - The applicant is encouraged to clarify if the proposal would be utilization only or also include implementation activities.

Mr. Matush - confirmed with Mr. Livingston the mill site was on state land.

Mr. Cox (representative for Mr. Livingston) - he has an agricultural lease with the 20 acres and has left several messages to Willie Lucero but hasn’t heard back.

Mr. Matush - asked Mr. Livingston where the area was.

Mr. Cox - explained someone from the Ranger District provided him with maps of that area. He said one reason the maps were vague was when he put the proposal together they were still trying to get the areas NEPA ready. The area was in the Northern San Mateo Mountains.

Mr. Matush - added strengths #12 (capacity for restoration), #13 and #10, and #22 (extensive expertise.)

Mr. Jervis - the panel discussed that this was a proposal for an equipment purchase and wouldn't do anything on the ground. He asked if the proposal would affect the intensity of wildfire.

Mr. Matush - Mr. Livingston talked about 1 million board feet and that was ambitious. The panel went with the last application on that.

The panel agreed to use the same language as the previous proposal for the strength.

Mr. Racher - on the recommendation about the letter from the Forest Supervisor- the forest supervisor got language from the first page of the narrative where it was underlined and had their own title. He thought the recommendation wasn't necessary because the title was in their executive summary.

Mr. Gomez - most proposals identify the title in their support letters.

Mr. Dunn - that is the title on page 1, the first sentence used that title.

Ms. San Gil- the panel's short list was taken off of forms typed and could be different.

Facilitator - the recommendation would be removed.

Mr. Pohlman - added strength- The letter provided by the forest supervisor acknowledges the proposal benefits to increasing forest restoration efforts and pledges to make the material available.

Mr. Dunn - clarified with the FS on the priority issue.

FS - discussion was about high risk community and Socorro County has a CWPP and that was the second highest priority.

Mr. Matush - asked Mr. Jervis if the Cibola had a large planning effort.

Mr. Jervis - it does and was approximately 18,000 in the planning effort. As far as #14 the project would increase the use of wild land fire use…that was a projection. If there wasn't a statement from the district that said they would burn it, it wasn't valid.

Mr. Matush –it was a projection because the proponent was taking so much material. He assumed if they were taking that much material it would be done as a maintenance project.

Mr. Bird - in future proposals the panel should encourage the FS and the proponent to discuss prescribed burning treatments.

Mr. Dunn - that type of recommendation was more appropriate on a straight implementation project versus utilization.

CFRP 08-11 – MURRAY HOTEL, LLC

There was no conflict of interests noted on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 08-11 Rev. 1
Organization:	Murray Hotel, LLC
Forest:	Gila
Project Title:	Utilization of Low Value Biomass through Integration with Solar Thermal Energy Production
Funding Requested:	$234,160
Matching Funds:	$58,497
Total Budget:	$292,657

Shaun Fisher provided the overview on this proposal.

This is a utilization project and the proponent seeks to improve the utilization of small diameter low-volume biomass. The proposal is a resubmission and seeks to design and evaluate performance of solid wood boiler systems related to solar thermal energy production. The proponent plans to establish and train crew in the use of these forms of energy.

The hotel is located in Silver City, New Mexico and is a commercial building which will acquire the local renewable resources. The project would support restoration and thinning primarily PJ types. The acres would not be treated directly. The grant funding would be used for design and engineering to integrate biomass fuel to solar performance. An estimate of four jobs would be created in areas of training, installation and operation of the systems. Education outreach would include field trips for local high school students. Grant County was one of New Mexico's 20 communities most at risk for wild fire. The project would receive its wood from Gila WoodNet who was also a collaborator and Strain Firewood who is also a supplier.

Collaborators on the project are Gila Tree Thinners, Gila WoodNet, Southwest New Mexico Green Chamber of Commerce, Silver City Joint Office of Sustainability, Leopold High School and Mimbres Valley Brewing Company. The overall intent of the project was to increase the use of environmentally sourced small diameter trees to enhance the vitality of local communities while restoring forests ecosystems.

It was not expected to be necessary to replant trees. The area is within the town of Silver City, Grant County and the municipalities of Santa Clara and Silver City. The project plans to use chuck firewood to burn in the boilers.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush - asked the proponent Kurt Albershardt how close the remodel is to being done and what has been done over the last year.

Mr. Albershardt - they were behind schedule and under budget. The full operation would be ramped up in the fall. The hotel occupancy rate was hard to get because only two properties reported into the system; the average for the county was about 70.22% and the best was about 90%.

Mr. Vincent - added strengths #17, 18, 19 and 29.

Mr. Racher – a restoration wasn’t part of the proposal.

Facilitator- the panel agreed 17 and 18 would be removed.

Mr. Racher - added strengths #1, 4 and 3 and weaknesses #3 and 11. The DFO was asked how close to the construction project the proponent was.

Gabriel Partido, FS - a letter was received that the District Ranger submitted because they met with the staff in the Grant Agreements Regional Office and received clarification. The office was fine with the proposal as it stands.

Mr. Racher- added strength- *Using renewable energy with the possibility of assisting a brewery was a win-win situation.*

Mr. Gomez- strengths #20-25 and a recommendation - *The proposal would be strengthened by having a map of the vicinity and the project site as part of the proposal.*

Mr. Olivas - added strengths #30 and 33. A PJ bole was clarified to be a tree.

Mr. Bird - regarding criteria #13 - *is the cost of the project reasonable and within fair market value.* Salaries and equipment costs were looked at and compared to other hourly rates were high. This project was nongovernmental but some proposals the salaries went as high as $80 an hour and he wanted to flag that.

Mr. Dunn – asked if it was for the same job. When the grants agreement people do the review for reasonableness they look at specific jobs, etc.

Mr. Payne - that was caught in Administrative weaknesses; it wasn't clear if the employees were contractors or hotel personnel. Particularly in renewable energy, most of the engineers were within the $80-100 range.

Mr. Racher- with the benefits it went even higher.

Mr. Payne – many of the proposals were in the $80-$100 range for the engineers involved with those projects.

Mr. Dunn- the items flagged in Administrative Observations will be a note to the Grants and Agreements technical staff to ensure costs was reasonable. They will develop examples like comparable rates to get the final budget approved. The process was in the code of federal regulations.

Mr. Gomez- the Administrative language didn't capture what Mr. Bird said.

Language was added to the Administrative language- *Hotel employee versus contractors hourly rates were unreasonable.*

Rates and benefit ranges were discussed among the panel members.

Mr. Dunn - asked for clarification from the applicant regarding the mechanical supervisor rates.

Mr. Albershardt - the mechanical supervisor is a licensed contractor who has no employees. Murray, LLC arranged with the contractor to hire and pay benefits on the journeymen and employees. The company pays WC on the contractor because the contractor has no employees and Murray is required to carry WC on all employees. The 14% is based on half percent over the previous year's number for the year on the employees.

Mr. Matush - the project is not an ordinary remodel and is extremely tough and quite involved.

Mr. Bird- when federal taxpayer money was used, his issue was that someone wouldn't be paid $100 an hour to do a job others made $25 an hour.

Mr. Matush - agreed to give the benefit of doubt. He added strength #22- *The proponent has extensive expertise and knowledge in the proposed activity.*

Mr. Jervis - added weakness #19.

Mr. Racher- noted that was a strength. Mr. Jervis withdrew the weakness.

Mr. Vincent - added strength - *The proposal involves high technical biomass use combined with solar and explores innovative renewable energy*.

Mr. Dunn - added a strength - *The proposal includes an excellent description of the advantages of using chunk wood versus other types of biomass fuel for heating (Page 3 of the narrative.)*

Mr. Berrens - added a strength - *The project tracks firewood processing variable costs against BTU content; this may allow future payment system based on expected BTU content.*

Mr. Pohlman - added a strength - *The project includes letter of endorsement from a local land manager who acknowledges the positive impact on long term forest restoration.*

CFRP 09-11 – OLD WOOD, LLC

There was no conflict of interest on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 09-11 Rev. 1
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

Danny Gomez provided overview on this proposal.

NEPA material purchased from Old Wood would be from NEPA completed areas. The project location is Las Vegas New Mexico and material cut from tribal and federal lands would be purchased by Old Wood. Treatment materials delivered to Old Wood Mill would be sawed for foreign products. Old Mill will purchase equipment that will speed production in the mill from 30,000-50,000 board feet per month to 200,000 or higher board feet per month. This will increase Old Wood's demand for raw materials from contractors working on state, county or tribal thinning projects.

The proposal includes education and training for youth and adults on all aspects of the Old Wood industry and Old Wood would provide onsite training. Monitoring will be provided by Forest Guild, Forest Watershed Restoration and Irland Group. Data gathering is from Alamo, Ramah and Vallecitos/Las Comunidades and Old Wood Mill. Monitoring will include board foot production; jobs created; job satisfaction for workers and overall benefits to the Forest and CFRP program. There are a total of 12 collaborators; 20 identified letters of commitment and endorsement and several product utilization commendations were identified. The proposal is a resubmission.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush - this project has found a market for wood products not present in any other proposal.

Mr. Jervis - the panel still operated in the 1-2-3-4 mode. If they liked the project they wanted to put on as much strength… But they don't need to do that anymore. The ranking was different and to stretch a strength doesn't do the project any justice because that wouldn't make a difference.

Mr. Matush - last year there was a lot of bias based on the number of strengths.

He added strengths # 29, 26, 24, 22, 18 and # 17 - *blends restoration treatment with a utilization plan*.

Mr. Jervis- disagreed. The project doesn't do that.

Mr. Matush - the proponent utilized different woods; salt cedar, cottonwood fir and pine.

Mr. Jervis - the proponent was using but not *treating* that.

Mr. Racher – on another project it was said the project was and they weren't actually doing forest restoration.

Facilitator - additional language was suggested – *The project facilitates*…

Mr. Dunn - the project doesn't include restoration.

Mr. Matush - agreed #17 could be removed.

Mr. Jervis- added strengths #1-4, 7, 12, 16, 23, 25, and 33.

Mr. Racher- added a strength - *The proponent has a good website*.

Mr. Matush - added a strength from the previous proposal regarding leveraging funding.

Ms. San Gil– read the language - *the project leverages funding to accomplish goals beyond CFRP funding available; they were not requesting salaries…*

Mr. Berrens- asked to amend the language and added - *over 80% of the nonfederal match was purchasing of wood products.*

Mr. Gomez- added a strength - *Pages 3 and 4 of the proposal provided a good breakdown of partners and a good explanation of each partners' roles.*

Another strength - *The appendix includes pictures and quotes of the proposed equipment that will be purchased*.

Ms. Burnett - added a weakness- *The letters provided by the Restoration Institute and the Irland Group do not confirm costs requested in the budget for monitoring activities.*

Ms. San Gil– in the past, panels looked to confirm that a group that was providing a match was confirmed; if they were paid for services the budget should have sufficient detail to determine costs.

Ms. Burnett - pointed this out as a weakness in other proposals. She looks for a commitment letter that confirms the cost of the service. The same weakness had been added to grant proposal number two.

Mr. Jervis - asked on weakness #33, program income; this proposal was just to buy equipment and any income generated would not be programming- or is it.

Mr. Dunn - if a piece of equipment is purchased and used in a way that generates income not otherwise received without the equipment that becomes income under federal regulations.

Mr. Jervis- added weakness #33.

Mr. Dunn - suggested the panel continue use #33 as a recommendation because it was now becoming clearer how to treat income and provide guidance.

Ms. San Gil- read the previous language and added it to the boilerplate - *If the application would be program income related to the federal grant, the income would need to be reflected in the budget.*

Mr. Racher - suggested the statement be added as a requirement.

Ms. Burnett - asked why matches were being treated differently than other services being paid for by the grant.

Mr. Dunn - part of the reason was when services were contracted under a grant, procurement regulations had to be followed. A sub awardee had to demonstrate it was a reasonable cost but the same procurement rules don't have to be followed. A nonfederal match has to justify up front it was a legal nonfederal match.

Mr. Racher- there was a history behind that and problems with ineligible matches that were thrown out.

Ms. Burnett - services provided by a contractor was similar to a piece of equipment which the applicant would normally provide support material of cost. She wants to see that the contractor/awardee, etc. could provide service that was reflected in the budget. The panel no longer has to be worried about a weakness causing harm to a proposal.

Mr. Payne - the RFA doesn’t require proponents to do that.

The panel agreed and it hasn’t been required in past years.

Ms. Burnett - not all weaknesses were requirements in the RFA.

Ms. Watson - added a strength -*The proponent should be commended that he developed a strong collaboration with not only one but four Native American tribes in New Mexico and is trying to utilize full implementation of more of the material.*

Mr. Olivas - added two strengths- *The project includes the international market. Also: The project creates value added product from waste material.*

Two entities are mentioned in the proposal; The Mescalero Tribe and King Air that have no letters of support. King Air is listed in the budget to do the duct work on page 7, mid page and again on page 6, second paragraph. The proponent was asked if there was a letter of support for the two.

Mr. Old - King Air is a minor supplier/contractor. There was an ongoing purchase relationship with the Mescalero but they were shut down. He has talked with them twice in the last month and they were not functional. They have a letter from Mark Hare, who runs the mill at Mescalero, but for the year in between the mill hasn't been running.

Mr. Payne - the Mescalero have an ARRA grant of almost $4 million and spent the last year revamping the mill.

Mr. Dunn - the only requirement in the RFA was letters of commitment from nonfederal sources supporting all cash or values of in kind services described.

He added a strength - *This project includes youth and adult education in the fundamental processing of woods such as pinion.* (In the executive summary)

Mr. Berrens - added additional language on strength #33 - *The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments, by vertically integrating to add off site sawing capacity.*

CFRP funded the original capacity building on-site for the plant and manufacturing and that has seen positive results. They are adding on to make portable saw mills off site to guarantee supply regularity. He commends them on that.

Mr. Pohlman - added a strength - *The project is endorsed by two forest supervisors that recognize the benefits to forest restoration and pledge material (volume) and collaborative support.*

Mr. Matush - added a strength - *The proponent improved the quality of the proposal from the previous year.*

Break- 3:40 p.m.-3:57 p.m.

Utilization was complete. The panel will start Planning Proposals next.

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

Review of Applications- CFRP 10-11 and CFRP 11-11

2011 CFRP Grant Proposals: Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

CFRP 10-11 – The Forest Guild

There was no conflict of interest noted on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 10-11
Organization:	The Forest Guild
Forest:	Carson, Planning
Project Title:	Rio Trampas Watershed Multi-Jurisdictional Forest Restoration Planning
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Tom Jervis provided an overview of the proposal.

The proposal is an example of a new way to look at planning and the proposal is for NEPA planning only and NEPA and NHPA clearance on 10,000 high priority acres of the 73,000 acres of watershed of the Rio Trampas of pinion, juniper, ponderosa pine and mixed conifer stands. The project is multi jurisdictional and encompasses BLM, FS, a land grant, tribal and state public lands. It will collaborate with private landowners in the watershed.

The objective of the project is to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the entire Rio Trampas watershed. Detailed clearance and plans would be developed for 10,000 priority acres but the entire 73,000 acres of watershed would be evaluated and would be an exceptional value of the proposal.

The proposal builds on CFRP-16-07 Santa Cruz and Embudo Creek Watershed Multi-Jurisdictional Restoration and Management Project which implemented forest structure restoration on 500 acres of BLM, FS and Truchas lands.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Gomez - added strengths - #1-5, 7-9, 11, 13 and 16.

Mr. Bird - there was very little that he didn't like about the proposal. He added strengths:

> *The project has in-kind archaeological services.* That is a significant cost for most planning projects.
>
> A strength - The proposal will prepare and commit to preparing for prescribed fires.
>
> Also strength- The project will set up controls and mixed conifer demonstrates a commitment to experimentation.
>
> Mr. Bird added a weakness - The hourly rates were high, especially $80 an hour. He had discussed the rate with the proponent. The rate was for more than the time of the individual and also includes the work of the organization Earth Works Institute and the product is of a very high quality.

Mr. Bird - asked the proponent for clarification on what Earth Works Institute would produce.

Mr. Krasilovsky - concurrently the work in the watershed is on complimentary efforts but with a focus on streams and water issues. The $5,000 was specifically for Earth Works work to assist with outreach and education because they have an outreach effort in the villages and would set up the community stewardship teams for watershed forest restoration issues.

Iggy Peralta, Carson NF - added that the rate was verified for this individual and was the same as what was charged to all projects. In regards to some of the other rates, such as Forest Guild, the rates are a federally negotiated cost rates and were agreed to by the federal government.

Mr. Bird - the one thing that jumps out at him is what they would get for the $80 an hour from Earth Works. He really likes the proposal other than that.

He suggested the issue be put under Administrative Observations because some of the rates for subcontractors seemed high.

Mr. Dunn - suggested language - *Assure that subcontractor rates were reasonable.* That would start a process for GNA people.

Mr. Matush - suggested it be a recommendation for the proponent to explain what would be received for $80 and the number of people that would be used.

Mr. Dunn - modified the statement for the recommendation to include *in the budget narrative*.

Mr. Jervis - added strengths: 15, 21-24, 26, 27 and 33.

He added a recommendation and modified the language of #12 - The proponent should work with other groups to include in the planning, the seasonal plans for the planning of activities to account for the reproductive season for birds and other wildlife, wet ground, and bark beetle flight seasons.

He asked that the recommendation be added to the boilerplate recommendations to be used again.

Mr. Peralta - if the proposal is funded; there is no ground disturbing activities.

Mr. Jervis – realizes the proposal was a planning grant but encouraged the proponent to build that into the plan.

Mr. Cooke - the proposal calls for a good portion of the project to be in archaeological services; another project that had archaeological services only applied to ground disturbing activities proposed. This seems an increased cost because an archaeological survey wasn't needed for the entire 70,000 to do fire lines and things for controlled burning. He asked if that was a valid concern that it was a third of the cost of the project.

Mr. Racher - archaeological surveys were done even when prescribed burn occurs although they were at a lower level.

Mr. Cooke - asked if an archaeological survey was required for a prescribed burn except in the fire line. The panel said it was.

Mr. Payne - it does require SHPO concurrence at some level.

Mr. Bird - clarified that all archaeological was in-kind.

The panel pointed out it was the State portion.

Mr. Peralta, FS - clarified in order to complete NEPA archaeological had to be done. The only possible treatments were not just prescribed fire; there could be thinning, watershed restoration, etc. The archaeological prices were a good deal and well within the line and allowed multiple process treatments to take place.

Mr. Cooke - a big part of planning was to make it efficient and this doesn't appear to be. The cost of on ground and putting people to work doesn't fit his criteria for a survey of large areas.

Mr. Dunn- first, CFRP invited planning applications in the RFA and applicants responded. Secondly, this project could fund cross jurisdictional NEPA and no other funding source in the FS could. This project has a unique opportunity to do treatment across landowner boundaries and is the reason planning proposals were invited.

Lastly as part of the NEPA project, an archaeological survey has to be done. The secretary's approach to the FS was to use this tool more. This type of cross jurisdictional collaborative NEPA projects have provided the supply of NEPA ready acres that many CFRP implementing projects on the ground are benefiting from because of past collaborative efforts, when the normal level of collaboration wasn't to that level.

Mr. Jervis - looking at the number of acres per dollar this was the cheapest of the planning proposals.

Mr. Payne - big bucks were being spent on clearances such as the Southwest Jemez project, etc. as the cost of doing business.

Mr. Racher - added a strength - *The aggregation of landscape scale/planning projects like this provide improved value i.e., lower planning and archaeological cost per acre.*

Mr. Racher - clarified from the proponent if the money from Earth Works was another source of federal funding.

Mr. Krasilovsky - he understood that non-federal funds would be acquired to do the work as well as in house Earth Works funds and that was stated in the budget.

Mr. Racher - added a weakness #27 - *The budget doesn't follow the RFA budget format; specifically year one was over matched by $150,000 and year 2 and 3 were under matched.*

Mr. Dunn - was told CFRP could not require a grant applicant to follow the budget format. The panel could say that information missing should have been presented in the budget justification. The proponent could only be required to follow a format if it's an official federal form.

Ms. San Gil- that was included in the Administrative Observations.

Mr. Racher - asked for a recommendation that the budget be adjusted to match in year one, two and three.

Mr. Dunn - the statement could be administrative but couldn't be a weakness that CFRP format wasn't used.

The statement in Administrative Observation #27 had language added- *year two and three were under matched.*

Mr. Archuleta – the panel discussed and agreed that an Administrative Observation would have to be taken care of through the grant administrator before the proponent could move forward.

Mr. Racher - added a recommendation - *The proponent should consider when preparing acreage for landscape scale NEPA, how funding would be acquired for implementation.*

Mr. Gomez - asked the proponent how far back the collaboration was started for this proposal.

Mr. Krasilovsky – since November, 2010 but the partners came together in a 2007 grant so the idea didn't come together until 2010.

Mr. Gomez - the appendices had letters from collaborators from February, 2010, so commitment or collaboration had occurred for some time.

Mr. Gomez added a strength- *The collaboration for this proposal has been in the works for over one year.*

Also strength - *Involves multi-jurisdictional planning and identifies commitments by each partner.*

And strength – *An excellent map identifies the communities within or nearby the planning proposal area.*

Mr. Matush - page 9 explains what was being done by Earth Works. He asked the proponent if a parawatershed study was being done; if there were controls.

Mr. Krasilovsky - he wasn't sure and would have to check.

Mr. Matush - erosion was mentioned a lot but he couldn't see anyone who knew how to measure erosion or it isn't a core indicator method as far as CFRP. Prescribed burns were disturbing and when the proponent mentioned that in the planning proposal he wanted to see that someone knows how. He looks for all of the SOPs (standard operating procedures.) It is important that he could see how it would be done and that it was standard.

Mr. Payne - asked if Mr. Matush wanted to capture these as recommendations.

Mr. Matush – no, it was new to a lot of people and he wanted to make it clear he looked for these things. He wanted to see how their proponent would do things and all of the SOPs.

Ms. Burnett - prefaced that it was a great concept for a planning proposal but the proposal needed work. She offered comments and weaknesses:

The budget requests were not supported by commitment letters from Hammerstone and Rocky Mountain College, LLC. That was critical because the rates were low and she wouldn't want to see the proposal stumble because the contractors/sub awardees couldn't work within the cost provided by CFRP.

There were two groups in the collaborator tables (page 3) that she didn't see commitment letters for in the appendices; the Acequia Abajo in El Valle Group was one. *The Mexico Environment Department is listed as having a cost in the nonfederal match but she didn't see a letter from them or see them mentioned anywhere else in the proposal; she wasn't sure of their role.*

Mr. Matush- they were mentioned on page 9 in the water quality.

Ms. Burnett - the NEPA project about to be launched was very complex. The proponent and the Forest Guild would be responsible for a consistent NEPA document for each agency; BLM, BIA and FS, which all have separate NEPA requirements. She asked who would coordinate.

Mr. Krasilovsky- the Forest Guild has worked with the Carson on the 2007 grant and has a good working relationship on a NEPA land grant now. Also he has worked on a couple of projects in Santa Fe with NEPA as well and thought they were suited to coordinate.

Mr. Bird - he could vouch for the Forest Guild staff; they were highly skilled in writing and research. Having done a planning CFRP project that was multi-jurisdictional he dealt with that by having one of the agencies lead the NEPA work and document and one EA. Their decision making process and public appeals processes were different.

Ms. Burnett - confirmed there will be three different FONSIs but one environmental assessment.

Mr. Payne - the FS was probably the most stringent and the representative was present.

Ms. Burnett – in the endorsement letter there was a level of hesitation. She read from the letter "the challenge will be combining reports across multiple jurisdictions since all have varying requirements and interpretation of NEPA." She thought collaboration on the project was something new and at this level of the project would have been good to have an additional year for ripening how to deal with this.

Mr. Peralta, Forest Service- understands that concern. It was heavily discussed how to proceed in the collaboration in the past. The letters from the District Ranger and the BLM both state they would offer the support needed by their specialist in order to do the review and prepare the documents to meet FS standards. A supervisor will not sign a Decision Memo that doesn't meet the standards. They have done multiple

NEPAs, on the Carson in previous years for CFRPs and are acquainted with how that has to work. The letters show commitment to the support staff.

Ms. Burnett - added weakness # 23 - *The budget doesn't appear to adequately support the work plan.* This was her concern and as a group they might decide not to post this weakness.

Mr. Gomez - added that the BIA Picuris Pueblo has an approved forest management plan in place with the environmental assessment, so the document from the BIA would just be category exclusion.

Mr. Matush - asked the FS how much of this would go CE.

Mr. Orlando Romero - said this wouldn't fit any of the categories.

Mr. Peralta - added this was multijurisdictional and probably be a smaller effort on the BIA. Most of the 10,000 acres would be on the Carson and would need an EA.

Mr. Dunn - regarding the last weakness #23, there was also a strength about the budget. He couldn't see a case for the weakness; the budget was extremely detailed.

Ms. Burnett - her comment was that the cost within the budget doesn’t support the level of work.

Mr. Bird - there was about 1450 hours for a Project coordinator, NEPA coordinator, and monitoring and science coordinators.

Ms. Burnett - her concern was with the Forest Guild’s time and the cost of contractors. Seven dollars an acre for biological work, considering the amount of time in the forest and stand exams that have to be completed and training… if the group didn't agree she was fine with it.

Mr. Dunn - if that weakness was stated without other weaknesses prior to that, it would have to have some detail.

Ms. Burnett - if everyone wasn't in agreement she would take the weakness out, but the two key players have not verified the work and that leads to the fact that the budget might not support the work plan.

Mr. Dunn - doesn't see that.

Mr. Matush - the panel was making the assumption that the proponent has not looked at the budget and that isn't fair to the proposal that they don't understand the work they were getting into.

Ms. Burnett - that is her concern. This is a great idea for a planning grant and she doesn't want them to stumble because their contractors couldn't commit to the work at the cost stated in the budget.

Mr. Matush - the same assumption could be made about their stream morphology and stream impairment work because they weren't using the right methods. That is an assumption that the proponent doesn't understand what they are getting into.

Ms. Burnett - isn't the proposal supposed to demonstrate the applicant's ability to understand what they would be doing.

Mr. Matush - it wasn't fair to state in a support letter an agreement to do 52,000 acres at $7.00 an acre.

Mr. Jervis - some implementation proposals say that.

Facilitator - confirmed the language written was okay with Ms. Burnett.

Mr. Vincent - added a strength- *The project offers potential for innovative watershed management practices such as encouraging aspen regeneration, watershed management practices that might consider snow pack optimization in the planning stage.*

Mr. Dunn - suggested that should be a recommendation.

Mr. Vincent – it is as a strength if these were included in the planning stages; it could enhance the watershed.

Mr. Berrens - realizing the full potential of the CFRP to handle multi-jurisdictional issues requires collaborators willing to take on multiagency NEPAs.

He added a strength - *Consistent with the USDA all hands approach, the project attempts cross-jurisdictional NEPA planning to facilitate strategic location of costly forest and watershed treatments.*

Mr. Archuleta- added strength #12 (criteria 14) - *Will add significant capacity to restoration*. That added to how well that project would contribute to long term management.

He added that #21 tied to criteria 6; # 22 to specific criteria #10 and #33 tied to criteria #5 as well as #11 tied to criteria #5.

He added strength - *The proposal includes acequias and government entities in the project (criteria #5 and #11.)*

Mr. Cooke - nothing discussed soils, hydrology or fuels and fire even though fire was a big criteria for the implementation of projects. He added a weakness- *Nothing in the proposal talks to fire, although it is a big criteria to implementation to projects.*

He asked the applicant what analogies would be done for fuels, hydrology and soil in the area.

Mr. Krasilovsky - sign in sheets from meetings showed who were involved and had specialists from Region 10. In terms of analysis; they would be consistent with what other agencies were currently doing.

Mr. Peralta - also listed on page 1, the first paragraph states that the restoration planning effort would focus on reducing the threat of large high intensity wildfires and included watershed health in the mixed tree ecosystems.

Mr. Cooke - it still doesn't say who would do the fuels; no fuels specialist was in the cadre of collaborators.

Mr. Krasilovsky - the project coordinator is a retired fire management officer from the City of Santa Fe and has a lot of experience with fuels analysis and environmental assessments. Also they work closely with the fuels specialist from the agencies. He thought there was good ground work for analysis.

Mr. Cooke - asked that his comment be under Weaknesses.

Mr. Romero - all of the agency specialist would be part of the ID team and do review and many of their staff have done analysis like that for years.

Mr. Cooke - the weakness in the proposal is that some specialized areas such as hydrology, soils and fuels management were not addressed.

Ms. Burnett - added that information should all be analyzed in the NEPA documents. Enveloped in the Forest Guild they stated they would work with agencies to complete the NEPA documents and that was everything that had to do with resources; soil water, fire and fuel, socio-economics, etc. That information is part of the NEPA analysis and might not be called out specifically but would be covered as part of the EA.

Mr. Dunn - the letter from the Carson NF from the District Ranger specifically said she would direct resource and NEPA specialists to assist with this project and review data and reports compiled by contracted resource specialists. He asked if that wasn't sufficient.

Mr. Cooke – asked if the Forest Supervisor's staff wildlife biologist, range person etc. wasn't included; why is there a wildlife specialist etc. on the team and in the proposal but not the others.

Mr. Payne - these people would provide expertise but the proponent would do bird surveys and archaeological work in the field. That wouldn't mean that the agency biologists wouldn't review the drafts by the contract employees.

FS- there is a mix of agency input and it is a capacity issue of what could be done with the number of staff they have. The archaeology and biology are more labor intensive and there weren't the resources to do the MSO calling and goshawk surveys on that much land.

Mr. Cooke – it is a weakness of the proposal but he would yield to the group. He added a recommendation - *The proposal includes a BIA commitment letter of support that should be from the line officer.*

Mr. Pohlman - added a strength- *The proposal includes an endorsement from the District Ranger that references the multi-jurisdictional benefits and emphatically commits her staff to successful collaboration.*

Ms. Burnett - added a recommendation- *The commitment letters from the BLM and BIA included a statement that they agree to share data with the other planning management agencies.* It could hold up the project if agencies couldn't share data because the analysis has to occur across the landscape.

She pointed out that strength #27 the proposal does not include collaborative interest forms.

Strength #27 was removed.

CFRP 11-11 Cimarron Watershed Alliance Inc.

No conflict of interest was noted on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 11-11
Organization:	Cimarron Watershed Alliance, Inc.
Forest:	Carson, Planning
Project Title:	Collaborative Landscape Restoration of the Middle Ponil Watershed
Funding Requested:	$346,820
Matching Funds:	$86,142
Total Budget:	$430,713

Mr. Matush provided an overview of this project.

The Cimarron Watershed Alliance is offering a planning proposal on the Ponil and the tributary is the Cimarron. The proposal started from a large fire in 2002 on the Ponil watershed. A four stand inventory will be conducted to supply data currently not available to support the NEPA planning effort to establish existing conditions on the middle Ponil watershed. The Alliance will act as a contract inspector to ensure data meets the FS standards. A wildfire hazard risk analysis will be performed and oversight and assistance will be provided with the contracted NEPA effort to establish timelines and benchmarks with wide public participation.

The planning process will identify specific treatment areas and methods and monitoring activities to restore and maintain the ecological help in that watershed (over 27,000 acres) to reduce the threat of an characteristic wildfire and its affect on downstream communities.

The project involves considerable stakeholder efforts.

Panel Discussion

Ms. Burnett - added strengths #1-5, 7, 11, 12, 13, 16, 21, 22 and 28.

Mr. Jervis - added strengths #8, 15, 23, 24 and 26 and weakness # 8 and the modified language for the recommendation on seasonal activities.

Mr. Matush- added strength #12- because it was a projection that the project *will* add to restoration efforts.

The proponent was asked the number of private landowners.

Michael Bain (proponent) - the acreage was large and one area was over 500,000 acres and another was 150,000, etc.

Mr. Matush - added strengths #16- it wasn't just the Forest Service; and strength #28 and 24. Detail for the language was –*the project coordinates with the CWPP*.

The proponent was asked if he could clarify the language.

Mr. Bain - it was actually a coordinating update.

Mr. Bird –has concerns about the high hourly rates. The language from the previous proposal was asked to be added regarding the Administrative Observation for contract personnel.

Facilitator - the language would be used from the Administrative Observation omitting Earth Works and adding hourly rates.

Mr. Bird - added strength - *The project was preparing for and demonstrated commitment to prescribed fire.* He asked for clarification from the proponent that the NEPA contractor has not been identified.

Mr. Bain - they haven't and he was working with the FS to develop an RFP process to identify that. He based his numbers on the past FS experience and specifically went for NEPA bids on this project.

Mr. Bird - added a recommendation- *The range of bids should be included so CFRP would know the budget was realistic when a NEPA contractor was not identified.*

Mr. Dunn - suggested the recommendation be boilerplate.

Mr. Olivas - added strength #32.

Mr. Racher - under Administrative Observations the indirect costs that were claimed should be moved to a direct cost.

Panel disagreed and it wasn't used.

Mr. Racher - added a strength -*The proponent collaborates with local forest entities to provide better integration of activities once the planning process is completed.*

Mr. Gomez- added a weakness #16 (people would do surveys on the ground.) There should be tailgate safety meetings, watch out for stepping in holes, wear hardhats, tripping, stumbling, etc.

The panel disagreed. The item was removed.

Mr. Gomez - added weakness #23- page 13 states the contractor would do stand inventories for $90,000 and page 28 states the four stand inventory and entire project would be led by the Questa Ranger District and would involve all collaborative partners.

Facilitator - that also has a strength. She asked Mr. Gomez to add more specificity.

Mr. Gomez- on page 13 Contractor Stand Inventory states the contractor would do the stand inventory for $90,000. Page 28, Objective one, states a four stand inventory and assessment and the entire project would be led by the Questa Ranger District and involve all collaborative partners.

Mr. Pohlman - the letter from the district provides some clarification; it talks about the role and the four stand inventory contractor and that they would act as inspectors for the contract to ensure FS standards and desired data collection.

Mr. Gomez - the proposal states collaborators would do the inventory and that wasn't a contractor to him.

Ms. San Gil- the applicant would receive and administer the funds and be responsible for ensuring the contractor does the work. The applicant is a nonprofit organization and because it was on FS land the stand inventory would also be overseen by the Ranger District. At least three groups would collaborate on the stand inventory; the Ranger District would oversee the technical aspects and the actual contractor, to be determined at a later time, would be on the ground.

Facilitator – asked if clarification was needed.

Ranger Jerry Mastel, Questa District - the explanation has been captured. As a collaborator they would provide leadership in that aspect but in terms of their agency requirements they also oversee the contracts and ensure everything is done according to FS standards.

Mr. Dunn - asked the Ranger's thought on the price of $90,000 on the stand inventories.

Ranger Mastel – participated in some of the conversations with the proponent and the Forest Program Manager and civil culturalist and they looked at different levels of stand exam to get a range of low estimates to determine a good figure for this proposal.

Mr. Bane- worked with the district biologist and the FS Supervisor and the figure was comparable prices in the local area.

Mr. Dunn - with that information it would be hard to add that as a weakness.

Ms. Fisher - asked Patricia Walsh to explain her position with the state. She could see Patricia donated her time and was also the president of the Watershed Alliance.

Patricia Walsh – she works for New Mexico's State Parks as the Regional Interpretive Ranger and was the President of the Cimarron Watershed Alliance. She was approached by Michael Bane, as the Executive Director of the watershed at the time and was looking for outreach and education as part of the grant.

Ms. Walsh participated as a stakeholder with the Cimarron Watershed Alliance (which includes three state parks) representing the state parks; she received approval from her supervisor to become a board member a couple of years later.

State park policy encourages employees to become active in community organizations and the majority of the work she does for the Watershed Alliance is done as a state park employee on state park time.

Mr. Jervis - asked the proponent if he planned to replant.

Ms. Walsh - the plan has a reference to riparian restoration and they have considered going back into areas where evergreens had grown into the riparian areas.

Mr. Cooke - asked the proponent if cattle were allowed to graze in the watershed. He was told yes. He asked how that was dealt with in the proposal; they were fencing out riparian areas for elk; what else they would do in regard to grazing management.

District Ranger Mastel - the NEPA analysis was just completed that re-authorized grazing and prescribed burning and range improvements within the Valle Vidal range (101,000 acres.) The Decision was signed December 2010 and incorporated all of that into the management of the Valle Vidal. NEPA was just completed and would be addressed in this planning effort and the Cumulative Effects section talks about where they were with grazing.

Mr. Cooke - added a strength - *Significant savings in project costs due to the process in objective three of deferring cultural clearances until projects are identified.*

Mr. Vincent- added strength #18 and #6. He asked that they pull from the previous proposal the language for the watershed management practices minus the aspen.

Ms. Burnett - added a strength - *The applicant is commended for incorporating the CWPP update in the NEPA process.*

Mr. Matush - asked Ms. Walsh if she made $50 an hour for the state parks.

Patricia - asked Mr. Bain to reply to that. She d*oesn't* make $50 an hour.

Mr. Bain - the $50 an hour rate was lower than the government cost. The corporate rate is $50 and reasonable and the tax rate and Patricia's value to the project was reflected.

Mr. Matush - the proponent should know by now what and how to measure and the method that would be used. He wasn't sure who the contractor would be or the method that would be used that would determine the planning process to reduce the threat.

Mr. Peralta - wanted everyone to know only a small portion of the planning area was burnt. Much of the project is prevention to keep the middle Ponil from the same process of burning. There wasn't a lot of common stand data and they would have to get that information.

Mr. Matush - the proponent should have a good idea before asking for planning money.

Questa District Ranger - the Southeast corner of that area was burned and had a stand exam. On the stand exam, in the unburned area there was little or no timber in the past and was why there was no stand exam data. The proposal was filling that gap; there was some harvest in the eastern portion but it burned in 2002 and was the need for the stand exams.

He interpreted Mr. Matush's comment on the last proposal and on this that he was referring to surveys that were part of the monitoring plan.

Mr. Matush- agreed. The proponent was being paid to do NEPA and common stand exams but outside the FS he isn't sure. He wanted to see exactly what they were going to do in the sites that were picked.

Ms. Burnett - the proponent couldn't be expected to do that at this stage because there is a public involvement and scoping process that informs where treatment will occur.

Mr. Matush - this has been done for 30 to 40 years with the Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural Research Station and is what they teach as far as planning.

Questa District Ranger- he was hearing Mr. Matush say that the proponent, where possible, should provide more substance to the monitoring plan. That was different from identifying a level of stand exam that they know about and putting that out to get estimates.

Mr. Matush- agreed. He would guess that Ms. Walsh knows the area well and would know where and how to measure and he doesn't want to pay the proponent the first year to find out who needs to be hired.

Facilitator - asked for language or the panel should move on. Mr. Matush agreed to move on.

Mr. Pohlman - added a strength - *The proponent included a letter from the District Rangers that demonstrates a history of collaboration and commits the agency to assigned roles.*

Mr. Bird – pointed out that his Administration Observation comment was pasted exactly as the previous proposal with *Earth Works and sub-recipients*. He clarified he was referring to the hourly rates of personnel and that some personnel were paid twice as much as others and wasn't able to understand the disparity.

Break- 5:53 p.m. - 6:02 p.m.

CFRP 12-11 – National Wild Turkey Federation

There were no conflicts of interest noted on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 12-11
Organization:	National Wild Turkey Federation
Forest:	Cibola, Planning
Project Title:	Puerco Landscape Planning Project
Funding Requested:	$334,875
Matching Funds:	$84,779
Total Budget:	$419,654

Mr. Olivas provided an overview of this project.

From the total project amount of $419,654, Heritage surveys would be $250,000, stand exams would use $50,000 and $3750 would be used for the project coordinator. Personnel costs total $308,750 of the project, plus the travel and indirect costs. A match of $84,779 would be provided by the proponent for their time and the partner's time and travel on the project.

The landscape in the project area was identified as a priority for forest restoration and totals about 96,000 acres and is adjacent to the Blue Water Watershed of 110,000 acres. Approximately 90% of the landscape is a class III fire restricted area. Cibola NF is committed to using staff specialist to complete the NEPA in house. The project builds off past CFRP projects adjacent to the Puerco planning area dating back to 2001 and includes 17 different projects. There are 13 collaborators on the project that include federal agencies, tribal, state, youth, conservation and business entities.

The objectives of the project are 1) to initiate NEPA on 16,000 acres and stand exams on 7,000 acres. 2) To reduce the threat of high intensity fires. 3) To reestablish fire regimes prior to fire suppression. 4) To continue to build upon and enhance the existing restoration collaboration within West Central New Mexico and 5) to use the most recent and available science data to be incorporated into the proposed action.

The National Wild Turkey Foundation monitoring plan would lead the collaborators in annual meetings to collectively identify the priority areas, review the ecological data, review the social data and track progress toward goals and objectives.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush - added a strength- *The planning proposal outlines the needs of measurements to subsequent restoration activities.*

Mr. Jervis - added strengths #1-5, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 32.

Mr. Bird - pointed out on #27- there were no collaborative interest forms. Mr. Jervis agreed and the strength was removed.

Mr. Bird - clarified that as much was being spent on stand exams and archaeology as more acres to be cleared on other planning projects.

Mr. Matush - the proponent stated what would be done to find out what to do when they were ready to implement; the last two proposals did not. The proponent presented a planning document and knows the priority areas, the measurements that would be used and the measurements would reveal what the restoration activity should be.

Mr. Bird- his interpretation was different. One of the proponent's objectives was NEPA and that would come out of the FS budget.

Ian Fox, Cibola NF - in addition to the 17,000 acres to be Heritage surveyed the FS has 16,000 acres that were Heritage surveyed that was adequate for intensive treatment.

NEPA clears through this process for treatment, over 30,000 acres and that was from funds that would be additionally leveraged to be spent on the area.

Mr. Bird - liked that the proposal built on the landscape efforts of the Blue Water. He added specificity to strength #16- *The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort that will result in over 200,000 acres of restoration activities.*

Ms. Burnett - asked who would conduct the ecological surveys. She asked clarification from the proponent.

Mr. Fox- it was included in the letter of endorsement from the FS; item 3, Mount Taylor District Wildlife Biologist would conduct… Additional forest funds would leverage the project.

Ms. Burnett - asked if that included general surveys or just specialized surveys.

Mr. Fox - a general biological report would be done but specific surveys would be conducted for the birds and new nesting areas would be identified or defined through those surveys. In addition everything else would be management indicator species for the management areas and mitigation design features would automatically be built into the NEPA.

Ms. Burnett - even though the FS provided a match to do the NEPA, three years seemed a lot of time. She would craft language.

Ms. Watson -added a strength - *This proposal was one of the first where the history of the fire was addressed.* That provides a discussion in the management's role of fire in the project areas/planning areas.

Another strength- *The proponent went to great lengths to get scientific references.*

Mr. Dunn- strength #11 could be modified - The project incorporates current scientific restoration information *"by including numerous references."*

Mr. Jervis - added a recommendation regarding the seasonal activities. He asked for clarification from the FS if there was a schedule for the completion of NEPA.

Mr. Fox - it would take three years to complete the required surveys and year four would be scoping, environmental assessment writing and the Decision. He would anticipate a DN one year after.

Mr. Olivas - confirmed with the proponent that the project would clear 17,000 acres; the budget stated 17,000 and the proposal listed 16,000. He was told the 16,000 was a typographical error.

Mr. Racher - added a strength –*The National Wild Turkey Federation through collaboration, has leveraged NEPA compliance from the FS for completing a project that neither could have completed on their own.*

Mr. Matush - added strength #33, and 22.

Ms. Burnett - added strength language- *The proponent was able to include US District Forest Service on the multi-party monitoring team.*

A weakness was added - *The proposal does not clearly state when NEPA would be completed once the project ends.*

Mr. Racher - that shouldn't be on the proponent; it should be from the FS.

FS - the letter from the FS Supervisor says it will be completed in 2015.

Ms. Burnett - agreed the weakness could be removed.

Mr. Vincent - on page 9 the proposal stated the proponent wants to reduce 5% of canopy closure but if they opened the canopy, large trees would have to be taken out. That was a contradiction with the restriction on large trees. It should be done and was related to groundcover dominated by litter and bare soil due to shade. He would draft a recommendation.

Ms. Fisher - the letter from the YCC was missing. FS was asked for clarification.

Mr. Fox - the Forest Guild contracted with the YCC and committed the YCC to be managed through the Forest Guild and the letter reflects that.

Mr. Matush - page six mentioned wood harvesters and utilizers. He asked FS if they would be actively working with them in the process.

Mr. Fox, FS- work would be done with local wood companies and manufacturers as partners not only on this project but also through building relationships through the Wild Turkey Stewardship Agreement that actively manages the Blue Water project. This would extend that effort.

Mr. Matush - added a strength #18.

Mr. Racher - wording was obtained and used from the previous proposal to reflect that the project integrated treatment with existing utilization industries.

Mr. Olivas - added strength #15 and - *The FS Supervisor letter of support provides good detail and commitment to the completion of the project.*

Ms. Burnett - asked the applicant how long they had worked with the collaborators. The sign in sheets provided were dated February 2011.

Mr. Fox - they worked with some of the collaborators a couple of years; some a year and a half and some at the beginning of this proposal.

Mr. Vincent - added recommendation language- *The proponent should determine how to address the issue of opening the canopy (page 9) and increasing grass and forbs ground cover that would probably require large tree removal.*

Mr. Fox- to get to a 40-60% canopy cover with an uneven based stand structure could be accomplished and the proponent wouldn't have to go after large trees to meet the other goals. NEPA process would allow for comments on the overall existing stand structure and the prescriptions and marking guides that would be implemented. The FS couldn't deviate from that; it was required by the Forest Management Plan.

The panel decided the recommendation would remain.

Mr. Pohlman- added strength - *The inclusion of wildfire suppression costs and monitoring plan could facilitate the comparison of forest restoration costs versus wildfire suppression costs.*

Mr. Matush - thought the language on page 8 "the monitoring and evaluation, review…track progress and implement an appropriate implementable sampling design to capture characteristics of each main forest type" was great. He added strength #31.

Mr. Berrens - couldn't understand how the indirect rate was calculated. He saw $17,000 of indirect charges in the nonfederal.

Mr. Dunn - there is a negotiated indirect cost rate.

Mr. Berrens - this was being applied to and includes New Mexico State Land Office, State Forestry, etc.

Mr. Fox, FS - travel was referenced to get to the multi-party monitoring teams.

Mr. Berrens- A total non federal of $84,000 includes state time. He doesn't understand why the negotiated rate of Wild Turkey would be on the state.

Ms. San Gil- possibly there was offset as to what could be charged to the federal funds. The proponent showed indirect cost on the nonfederal match so this program only allows them to charge 10% to the federal funds.

Mr. Berrens - there could be overmatch on the indirect. This might be a solvable problem but it wasn't correct to apply a negotiated rate on a state agency.

Mr. Dunn - suggested adding *"to ensure that indirect cost rates were appropriate and applicable"* at the end.

An Administrative Weakness was added- *It appears that Wild Turkey negotiated indirect costs were applied to other entities such as the state of New Mexico. Assure that indirect cost rates are appropriate and applicable.*

Ms. Burnett- added an Administrative Weakness- *The stand exam and heritage survey costs were incorrectly categorized as Personnel and should be sub awards or contract.*

April 26, 2011

CFRP 13-11 Rev 1 – Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.

Coleman Burnett left the room due to a conflict of interest.

Project Number:	CFRP 13-11 Rev. 1
Organization:	Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.
FOREST:	Cibola, Planning
Project Title:	Multi-Jurisdictional Collaborative Landscape Analysis
Funding Requested:	$353,076
Matching Funds:	$88,269
Total Budget:	$441,345

Tim Pohlman provided an overview of the project.

The proposal was a resubmission and would complete planning and environmental documentation for 19,000 acres of pinion/juniper forest on NF, BLM, and State Land Office jurisdiction. The project map identifies the project in the Durkee Bolander unit. Completion of the project would complement 37,000 acres of NF in 2700 acres of BLM lands where EA environmental analysis is complete or underway as well as 60,000 acres of state lands where management plans have been completed.

The management emphasis for the area is to return overstock of PJ forest to a natural condition through mechanical treatments and prescribed fires. The Alamo Navajo School Board proposed to coordinate the analysis and documentation and manage the partnership that will scope the public for information about the proposal in assistance with prioritizing treatment areas. USFS personnel will train Alamo Navajo youth to conduct stand exams, fuel surveys and spotted owl and goshawk surveys. SWCA Environmental Consultants will conduct Heritage surveys and write draft and final EA's and conduct botanical surveys. The FS and BLM will write Decision Documents and the project will culminate in 2014.

The project is identified as high priority for fuel reduction in the Socorro County Hawk or Wild Protection Plan. The project builds capacity in two important ways: 1) combines with similar efforts to plant forest restoration across jurisdictional boundaries and 2) cultivates forest management knowledge and experience in the Alamo Navaho youth workforce that has been undergoing training in project implementation and wood utilization from previously awarded CFRP grants.

The proponent commits to preservation of old and large trees. Other management goals throughout the landscape projects in the area were to reduce the risk of wildfires; improve watershed conditions; diversify vegetative communities; create a greater range of options to manage wildfires and to use prescribed fires to achieve resource objectives.

The project has 11 letters of support. Monitoring includes indicators that attempt to capture the efficacy of the NEPA process.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Olivas- added strengths- #15, 26, 29, 33, 8 and 10.

Mr. Dunn- pointed out this proposal is a *revision* as opposed to proposal #6 that was indicated.

Mr. Matush- added a strength- #31.

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- #1-5, 7, 11-13, 16 and 22-24.

Mr. Jervis- added a strength- #32 and the seasonal recommendation from previous proposals.

Mr. Matush- on page 37 the strengths were clarified from last year.

Mr. Jervis- asked FS how many acres were currently available that were not under contract for the NEPA cleared restoration. He asked what the mechanical restoration treatments would be.

Ian Fox, FS- 50,000-60,000 acres were available and 45,000 would be mechanically treated. The proponent has asked for another undetermined amount of acreage to be treated.

Mr. Jervis- there was a 10 year backlog.

Mr. Fox- the initial companies have made more investments.

Mr. Racher- Cibola has ramped up forest restoration. This one has funding and they are trying to head in that direction.

Mr. Bird- asked to add a strength from the previous proposal about the Land Manager and the proponent being committed to prescribed fires.

He wanted to raise a red flag on the high hourly rates and asked to add the previous Administration Observation regarding reasonable rates.

Mr. Gomez- added strength- *Pages 8 and 9 explain the type of surveys, who would do them and the information that would be collected.*

Mr. Matush- clarified from FS if NEPA would be only for thinning.

Mr. Fox- approximately 13,000 acres would be prescribed and broken down.

Ms. Watson- added strength- #33- *The proponent talked about project history and went on to say the current objectives to build. The proponent should be commended that they would provide jobs for the underserved community.*

Mr. Racher- added a strength - *The DR letters note that people would be trained to conduct stand surveys. That has become important to fill gaps that would otherwise result in things falling down*

April 26, 2011

CFRP 14-11 – San Antonio De Las Huertas Land Grant

There was no conflict of interest noted on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 14-11
Organization:	San Antonio De Las Huertas Land Grant
Forest:	Cibola, Planning
Project Title:	San Antonio de Las Huertas Land Grant Planning to Reduce Wildfire Risk
Funding Requested:	$119,994
Matching Funds:	$30,000
Total Budget:	$149,994

Mr. Racher provided the description of this project.

The San Antonio De Las Huertas Land Grant would be referred to as the Land Grant, hereafter. The project has a one year application to conduct the environmental review in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act for a total of 448 acres including 108 acres of land grant commons and 340 acres of forest service land, as well as conduct planning activities associated with the development of our forest restoration plan aimed at reducing the threat of large, high intensity wildfires in our community.

The project has been identified as a very high priority for the FS to accomplish. Partners have been identified as the Las Acequias de Placitas, San Antonio Ditch, Bernalillo High School, Bosque School, East Mountain Interagency Fire Protection Association, the Coronado Soil and Water Conservation District, Placitas Fire Department, Las Placitas Association environmental organization, New Mexico State Forestry and the Cibola Forest Sandia Ranger District.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush- the endorsement letter from Nancy Rhodes was glowing.
He added a strength- *Nancy Rhodes would dedicate staff to complete the project. This was a high priority planning area located in a high area of public use.*

Ian Fox, Cibola NF- explained that lawsuit asked for an ethno study to be completed.

Mr. Gomez- added strengths -#1-5, 21-26 and 28- *The proposal includes training in the best management practices in the Placitas area for reducing hazard and in-site characterization techniques to guide ecological restoration.*

Ms. Burnett- added strengths- 7, 8, 9, 12, and language to #23- *Good budget details and/or work plan and the level of detail regarding NEPA process is very clear.*

Another strength- *Combining the NEPA process with a community wild fire risk assessment is commendable.*

Mr. Archuleta- added strength - *The inclusion of acequias as government entities (criteria 5.) The headwaters of the acequia are in the Forest Service land in this case.*

Another strength- *Combines the NEPA process with a community wildfire risk (criteria 14 and 11.)*

Ms. Fisher- the project was going to be funded last year and was not. The CFRP would allow the proponent and the Cibola NFS to collaboratively work toward NEPA on multi-jurisdictional clearance with other community partners.

A strength- *The project provides a unique opportunity to build a collaboration that hasn't previously existed among community groups and local governments.*

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #11 and 16 and the generic seasonal recommendation.

Mr. Cooke- added a weakness- *This proposal has much higher costs per unit than similar planning projects.*

Mr. Matush- asked why Parametrix was hired.

Mr. Fox- Parametrix has the ability to work with the land grant and adults and bridge the gaps between partners and the facilitation. The wild fire risk assessment wouldn't have had forces to do that and was why per acre costs seemed high; it was more other long term elements.

Mr. Dunn- asked if this is a similar planning process.

Mr. Fox- the project has more of an education component to the community members and is not just a land grant but goes above and beyond NEPA with wildfire risk management etc. It is a long term investment that was amended outside of the NEPA project.

Ms. Burnett - part of the issue is that a per acre comparison only, couldn't be done; all of the same resources need to be analyzed.

Mr. Dunn- suggested taking the weakness out.

Mr. Archuleta- to do the mathematical comparison, the 37,000 acres should be taken out of that.

Mr. Matush- added strength- #31- *An objective stated on page 5 that all of the planning led to collaboration.*

Ms. Burnett- added a recommendation- *The proponent should provide a one year budget detail and unit cost.*

April 26, 2011

Mr. Fox- added that the investment in the project and the acreage was in the letter of endorsement by Nancy Rhodes. The stakeholder agreement to this project was a springboard. That investment would provide for a streamlined process that directly improves the communities.

Mr. Berrens- added strength- *It was most important that the proponent added the fire risk and as a byproduct of landscape assessment, the education and outreach included a provision of fire-wise training for private landowners, especially in high risks areas.*

Ms. Fisher- added strength- *This proposal helps to move a community toward self-sufficiency by becoming better land stewards and to become self sufficient and to increase their knowledge of best management practices.*

Mr. Jervis – on strength #11; the references weren't there.

Mr. Dunn- references were on page 3 at the bottom of the first paragraph. The recommendation could be to include more discussion of the information in the material that was cited.

A recommendation was added- *The proposal would be strengthened by elaboration and summarization of information from the sources cited on pages three and six.*

Mr. Jervis- It was not current scientific information to say the forest was overstocked.

Mr. Archuleta- back to NEPA and 48,000 acres dedicated to NEPA. It was important to point out it was a large scaling grid and the acres are within the community and that raised the cost. The variability of the range was mentioned and was within market costs and it was priced appropriately.

Mr. Cooke- didn't see anything separated out.

Ms. Burnett- The budget detail of the contractor is great and there is a good work plan.

Facilitator – it sounds as though the strength should be left.

Ali- suggested wording in the weakness that it *could add the value on a larger scale*.

Mr. Cooke- the proposal would still get funding; leave the wording.

Mr. Archuleta- NEPA cost is lower for land that has been occupied for hundreds of years.

Mr. Jervis- the panel should be careful about pulling the NEPA costs. The panel is talking about planning proposals.

Mr. Archuleta- this was based on total project costs; the panel has to look at total costs.

Mr. Dunn- this is similar to costs per acre for treatment; there might be a high priority area for treatment but that is super dense and super expensive and that wouldn't mean therefore it was a lower priority for attention.

Mr. Berrens- supported taking the weakness out. He could see the proponent would probably work with a lot of sites.

The weakness was removed.

Mr. Olivas- added strengths- #10 and 15.

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

Adjourn

The panel adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

April 27, 2011

Review Agenda for the Day

Facilitator Rosemary Romero said there were 12 proposals to review for the day. The sign in sheet was located in the back of the room for those attending.

Mr. Dunn mentioned if there was something on the screen that was taking a lot of discussion; it should come off and in the past that helped facilitation move more quickly.

Facilitator Romero said she would set a timer for half hour increments for each applicant. That would ensure each applicant received equal time and to be fair she may have to cut a panel member off to stay on track.

Dan Barrone was out the previous day and was present today.

Review of Applications- CFRP 15-11, CFRP 16-11, CFRP 17-11 Rev. 1
Strengths Weaknesses and Recommendations

CFRP 15-11 – San Juan Soil & Water Conservation District

There were no conflicts of interest for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 15-11
Organization:	San Juan Soil & Water Conservation District
Forest:	Cibola, Planning
Project Title:	Collaborative Landscape Scale Restoration Planning in the Chuska Mountains, Navajo Nation
Funding Requested:	$275,200
Matching Funds:	$68,800
Total Budget:	$344,000

Mr. Vincent provided an overview of the project. The budget was for 3 years from August 1, 2011 to July 31, 2014. The objective was to complete a NEPA site specific analysis on 8,702 acres of ponderosa pines and mixed conifers. Partners include Navajo Forestry Department, BIA, San Juan Soil and Water Conservation District, Navajo Fish and Wildlife Department, San Juan Cooperative Weed Management Area, Newcomb High School, Grand Canyon Trust, Rocky Mountain Ecology and Hammerstone Archaeological Services.

Planning involves forest restoration, fuel reduction and TSI in two places with WUI interface homes, historic sheep camps and a fish hatchery. The scope of work contains an analysis under the NEPA compliance process and includes cultural and biological surveys; public scoping; preparation of Record of Decision and the development of the Natural Resource Training Program for tribal high school students. Specific outcomes based on a base land resource studies; project scoping, completion of NEPA documentation and involvement of the high school students in training.

The proposal lists the desired CFRP outcomes as standard and the scientific basis that refers to numerous other publications.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Bird-added strength #14 - *The proponent was committed to and promoting the use of prescribed fire* (page 5, criteria #2.)

Ms. Burnett- added strengths- #1-5. The sub-awardees have committed their costs in their letters and this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.

Mr. Barrone- added strengths- #10-13.

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- # 22-24, 26 and 28 and a strength - *Pages one and two of the proposal describe well the roles and responsibilities of each of the key personnel and sub awardees.*

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #7, 8 and 32.

He added recommendation #8- it was not clear to him if the match was nonfederal.

He added seasonal language from the previous proposals.

Mr. Vincent- added a strength- #9, *Reduces fire risk in wild land priority areas and historic areas.*

Mr. Dunn- the strength couldn't be added unless it was actually on the New Mexico Communities at Risk. He suggested- *The project implements a community wildfire protection plan.*

Facilitator- read the strength language- *Reduces the fire risk in wild land urban interface.*

Mr. Dunn- on strength # 26; cross jurisdictional- his notes said all was on tribal land. Others agreed and strength # 26 was removed.

Mr. Matush- added strength #31. The applicant was asked to clarify what the significance was (on the first page) of the NNFD currently under P.L. 93-638 self-determination contract with the BIA.

Shawn Knox (for applicant) - the Forestry Director of the Navajo Forestry was referring to a clause in the letter that means the match is okay.

Mr. Berrens- the weakness should be removed, that the match was not nonfederal.

Mr. Dunn- statute 638 specifically gave the tribe authority to use that as a nonfederal match; that is true for all tribes.

Recommendation #8 was removed.

Mr. Barrone- asked explanation under weakness of- “anticipated program income-the budget doesn’t address… ”

Mr. Dunn- the panel had developed standard language the previous day, if there was anticipated program income the proponent has to deal with that before the grant can be awarded.

Panel members mentioned this was a *Planning* proposal so why would there be income.

Facilitator- standard language was adopted.

Mr. Olivas- has two questions; one in reference to criteria #12 on the priority area for hazardous fuel reduction. The first executive summary (first paragraph, page 1) mentions a forest management plan for forest restoration fuels reduction and … and includes two special management areas adjacent to a wild urban interface community. He asked if that justified that.

Mr. Dunn- that area is all tribal and would not be cross jurisdictional.

Mr. Berrens- an earlier point was whether this was in a priority area.

Mr. Olivas- on page 2, second paragraph states the NNFD recognizes the planning effort is multi jurisdictional in nature… He asked if that would put #26 back up. The boiler plate phrase says *cross jurisdictional activities*; does that include the land or different partners.

Mr. Dunn- the cross jurisdictional phrase to him means it has to cross land management jurisdiction, like FS, tribal, BLM, County, etc. and goes back to the act that describes that is federal, tribal, state, county, and municipal.

Mr. Olivas- that would weigh on criteria 11; does the proposal facilitate landscape scale multi jurisdictional effort.

Mr. Dunn- multi-jurisdictional means to him cross land; jurisdictions within tribal government wouldn't be considered cross-jurisdictional.

Mr. Gomez- asked what *activities* on “explanation of activities” means.

Mr. Dunn- it means activities related to the objectives and the activities funded through the grant. A planning effort that was involved such as a land grant, a tribe etc.

Mr. Gomez- or field trips to another area; that could be activity too- cross jurisdictional.

Mr. Dunn- doesn’t think so. The reason that is in strengths is to encourage a land grant to work with the adjourning tribe on a NEPA process that crosses jurisdictions, for example.

Mr. Olivas- added strength #15.

Mr. Archuleta and Mr. Racher entered the meeting at this time.

CFRP 16-11 – Aspen Forest

Shaun Fischer had a conflict of interest on this project and left the room.

Project Number:	CFRP 16-11
Organization:	Aspen Forest
Forest:	Carson, Planning
Project Title:	Restoration of the Ojo Pilot & La Joya Wildland Urban Interface Units in the Carson National Forest
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Ann Watson provided the overview of this project.

This proponent would restore and harvest approximately 332 acres within the two project areas on the Carson NF and Rio Arriba County managed by the Camino Real Ranger District and Peñasco. Both units have NEPA clearance and the project is designed to address ecological goals of the Carson NF and the socio-economic of the integrated surrounding communities. The ecological goals are to restore the cultural integrity to the areas ecosystem functions, reestablish national fire regimes, improve stand structure, species composition and the preservation of all old growth trees. The desired outcome is a restored forest that would not require an extensive restoration reentry or have the probability of a catastrophic fire.

The socio-economic goals will be addressed by supporting and strengthening jobs in the forestry industry through the local community. All logged wood will be transformed into viable marketable products such as children's toys and flooring, vigas, latillas, building materials and log cabin kits. Aspen Forest Products will provide wood biomass to the Northern New Mexico College for its biomass program. All harvested and transformed material will be stamped sustainable to create public awareness. The proponent intends to harvest approximately 210,000 board feet of material and 890 cords of firewood from the Ojo Pilot project area.

The La Joya WUI unit will produce approximately 40,000 board feet and 462 cords of firewood. There will be no need to replant. This project is for three years and some partners will include Rio Arriba County, Truchas Land Grant Community Members, the SIPI, Albuquerque Public Schools, Northern New Mexico College, Carson Watch and Pojoaque Pueblo, New Mexico's Own, the State of New Mexico and US Congress and the Audubon Society.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Barrone- added strengths- #1, 2, 4, 6, 15, 18, 19, 26 and 33.

Mr. Bird- added strengths #12, 13 and 14 (criteria 2.) With his standard editorial: the proposal mentions the desired future outcome that doesn't require reentry, which he hasn't seen before and the proponent will do prescribe burning. "The Carson will conduct implement prescribed burning."

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- #16, 17, 20, 21, 22-24 and strength- *A good explanation of how and what the purchase equipment would be used on the project.*

Another strength- *The proponent listed the estimated volume of wood products (page 1.)*

Also strength-Wood products would be removed from the project area (page 1.)

Mr. Jervis- added weakness- # 9 and 33 and recommendations- #5- he was concerned about the income #12, and 13.

Mr. Olivas- challenged # 9 as a weakness- old growth was mentioned on page 1. He suggested it be taken out.

Ms. San Gil- #9 is listed in both the strengths and the weaknesses.

Mr. Jervis- the proponent is cutting trees up to 24 inches in diameter.

Mr. Racher- there is a conflict between strengths and weaknesses. The proponent states they would preserve old growth trees but page 6 states they would remove large diameter white fir. He understood why; white fir was an undesirable species tree and has increased, but it is a discrepancy in the proposal.

Mr. Jervis- his problem wasn't with reducing the white fir but that shouldn't be done by taking out a 24 inch white fir that has been there since 1900.

Mr. Dunn- the only time he has seen “preserve old and large trees" not apply was when removing a non-native exotic like a Russian olive etc.

Mr. Gomez- asked for clarification from the Carson NF why this was done.

FS Ranger (Peg Grimm?)- both areas were set up for commercial units. They talked with the regional office who agreed to let them pull back for Aspen Forest Products to submit under CRFP. White fir wasn't a desirable species and was why some would be removed to promote Douglas fir other species that were more desirable for wildlife and products.

Mr. Payne- understood why the panel wanted to take it out but when this is set up as a timber sale no one could say this is not an old and large tree. It couldn't be a strength that it would preserve old and large trees; it doesn't change the rating.

Mr. Dunn- this is more than a rule, technically this is an eligibility criteria for receiving a CFRP grant.

The panel talked about the eligibility criteria.

Mr. Racher- the eligibility criteria states *"will preserve old and large trees”* it does not state that they wouldn't be cut and it wasn't absolute language.

Mr. Matush- it is part of the climate and should stay.

Facilitator- the item will be left as a weakness.

Mr. Dunn- on page 1, the proposal mentions the product would be stamped sustainable to create public awareness; that is inappropriate and usually implies certification by an outside independent body like FSC or Smart Wood. The Forest Service has not agreed to any process or certification for sustainably managed trees being marked in that way.

He added language- *Stamping wood sustainable is inappropriate because it implies certification from an independent outside body such as Smart Wood or FSC.*

Mr. Racher- disagreed; once the wood was owned outside of the FS, the owner could do whatever they wanted with it.

Mr. Dunn- having worked on the forest certification issues for years; it is essentially false advertising.

Mr. Racher- people who buy into a sustainable mark on the wood, is either buying into what has occurred with the wood to that point or has not researched what is meant by *sustainable* wood.

Mr. Dunn- in this case if the grant was funded the FS would be approving that activity. The FS specifically states as an agency policy, that the FS will not engage in independent certification by forest stewardship council.

Mr. Bird- asked if that applied to the firewood company reviewed earlier.

Mr. Dunn- the language should probably be boiler plate. The word *sustainable* implies FSC certification.

Mr. Berrens- disagreed; sustainable has a lot of definitions. What the FSC owns is their certification. The proponent wasn't putting FSC certification on the product. The FS does the known the word sustainable.

Mr. Payne- Southwest Pinion and many people on their packaging have “this was harvested in a sustainable fashion" so there is precedent from this program where CFRP funded statements like that.

Mr. Berrens- he understood a *certification* could be owned – like xyz certification.

The majority of the panel agreed to the remove the weakness.

Facilitator- asked Mr. Berrens if his recommendation was to put this under Administration.

Mr. Racher- received a directive from the Chief of the FS that said "a directive has been issued to all units calling for increased use of locally milled wood in all new agency buildings and facilities and directing the heads to incorporate FS policies in domestic sustainable wood products as preferred green building material in USDA facilities and buildings."

If the proponent wasn’t getting them from the FS, where would they get them?

Mr. Dunn- agreed for the weakness to be removed.

He added weakness #28- The distinction between the project and the previously funded CFRP grant is unclear. The language was modified to include- *There is a mention of the 2010 CFRP grant of Aspen Forest Products on page 2, but information wasn't provided on the progress of the grant status and performance.*

Mr. Archuleta- asked about the distinction; these are two separate work areas.

Mr. Dunn- the concern is if the proponent has a current CFRP grant and asked for another one, information on the performance and status of the previous grant has to be provided.

Ms. San Gil- the program income has been put into recommendations on other proposals.

Mr. Olivas- added strengths- #7-12, 29 and 9.

Mr. Archuleta- added strength # 22.

Mr. Pohlman- strength - *The proposal includes a letter of support from the District Ranger confirming the forest restoration goals and committing to participation in educational efforts.*

On weakness #28 -equipment was being purchased and a previous grant was out there. He asked if the previous grant had anything to do with the nonfederal match. He couldn't tell if the equipment was federally funded.

Mr. Dunn- this was another reason for having information on the previous grant. One problem is looking at the administrative issue, adding the total hours for personnel in the previous grant to these hours; it comes to more than 100%. In a federal audit that would be a problem and auditors would say the grantee now owed the feds for the difference.

Mr. Matush- asked if FS required quarterly or semiannual reports.

Mr. Dunn- they do, but this is a new application, if this was accepted and they don't have that information from the first grant and this could become an audit finding.

Facilitator - there is additional information under Administrative Observations and it would be left there.

Mr. Racher- many small business owners work more than 2087 hours in a year.

Mr. Dunn- FS operates under the CFR and there is a specific code of federal regulations.

Ms. San Gil- the AARA grants was audited and one of the biggest findings was related to personnel and charging time and work on multiple projects or multiple matters. On federal grants one person cannot be budgeted more than 100% of their time.

Ms. Burnett- added a weakness- *The collaborator contract letters (Audubon and SIPI) do not verify budget reports.*

Mr. Jervis- added a weakness- *The executive summary states that the Sangre de Cristo Chapter of the Audubon Society will guide the educational aspects of this project and its effects on forest wildlife habitat. The support letter is from Audubon New Mexico which is a different entity. More importantly the letter specifically states they would provide curriculum for up to 240 first through fifth grade students but doesn't mention guiding the effects on New Mexico's forest wildlife habitat.*

He said Audubon signed up to provide educational programs but not to do monitoring.

Mr. Racher- asked the proponent what the current WC rate was and was told 20%. The fringe rate was usually around 25% and was universal and 25% looked low.

Facilitator- that was picked up under the Administrative Observations; Ms. San Gil added they picked up it was called a universal rate and that no explanation was provided for what it was for.

Mr. Olivas- clarified previous applications range from 14% to 26%. He asked if this was different because it was implementation. He was told it was because it was in the woods.

Mr. Racher- WC rates have been reduced through the forest workers safety certification to roughly 20-30% but the proponent has to be sure they paid enough to cover WC. He asked if there was something included about wage determination under Administrative Observation.

Ms. San Gil- it was picked up that last year's proposal had different rates than this year and it should be ensured that a written personnel procedure would document salary increases.

Mr. Racher- working on federal lands they have to deal with federal wage determinations by the Department of Labor. They require workers to be paid the minimum amount. He wasn't sure if the wages were a minimum amount for the Carson.

Language was added to the Administrative Observation- *Ensure Federal Department of Labor minimum wage determinations were followed.*

Mr. Racher- added weaknesses- #11 and 15 and language for #15- *The estimation of markets and value products for biomass, toys and log utilization.*

Mr. Bird- asked for more explanation on #11; it wasn't clear from the project area map the proponent would harvest from public land.

Mr. Racher- they would harvest from public land but would purchase capital equipment. A requirement was that the majority of the material processed with the equipment comes from public lands.

Mr. Dunn- it's more complicated than that. After the grant is completed, one of the determinations of what happens with the equipment was that it could remain with the grantee; in that case the grant wouldn't be technically closed and would remain open. The federal and land interests are in first place for the use of the equipment over other entities though it does not preclude them from using the equipment to process nonpublic lands, but federal lands have priority.

The equipment could be sold or the grantee could purchase the equipment so there are a number of options.

The panel discussed the weakness; it was suggested it be a recommendation. It was thought a minor weakness; recommendations need to be addressed before a grant was given.

Mr. Dunn- given the understanding of what would happen with the equipment after the grant, he suggested they not include the comment.

Leaving it out was supported since this came up on utilization.

Mr. Dunn- based on Mr. Jervis's comment on Audubon participation- the first sentence in the third paragraph stated that "Audubon would help measure and document the success of the restoration project."

Mr. Jervis- they don't have the capacity to do that even though they committed to it. He agreed it could be taken out; he saw it more as vague than a weakness.

The weakness was removed.

Mr. Racher- since capital equipment is being bought; no quotes or estimates were in the budget.

Mr. Payne- asked if the RFA said they have to have quotes; before the proponent buys the equipment, they will have to have three quotes. That can't be called a weakness if the proponent wasn't told that has to be done.

Ms. Burnett- this was discussed the previous day and generally weaknesses could be things that were not defined as RFA rules; they could be things the panel found as a weakness to the narrative.

Mr. Dunn- "quotes from suppliers for equipment purchases were not included in the appendix" would be a weakness.

Ms. San Gil- the panel has not required that from other proposals.

The panel thought the item should be a recommendation.

Mr. Archuleta- when weaknesses, strengths etc. were added it would be good to tie them to criteria; especially a weakness. It would be good for the applicant's sake with everything based on the criteria, and would help the applicant with future applications.

Ms. Fisher returned to the room for Project CFRB 17-11

CFRP 17-11 – Rocky Mountain Youth Corporation

There were no conflicts of interest noted on this project.

Project Number:	CFRP 17-11 Rev. 1
Organization:	Rocky Mountain Youth Corporation
Forest:	Implementation
Project Title:	Implementation of Restoration Activities in Questa/Lama WUI
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Arturo Archuleta gave an overview of this Implementation project. The purpose of the project is to hire and train youth crews to treat 164 acres of ponderosa pine and juniper forest in the Questa/Lama WUI. The project would hand plant approximately 5,624 Ponderosa pine seedlings on 25 acres of FS land devastated by the 1996 Hondo fire.

Wood removal from the treatment site will be distributed to elderly and disabled community members for use as firewood by a local community group.

Mr. Archuleta liked that the project would provide all of the workers the fire/OSHA training.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Racher- added strengths- #2, 3, 6, 8, 13, 15, 21, 22 and 24.

He added weakness #2 with detail- *The proponent was not working with industry or commodity groups.*

Another weakness # 5 with detail- *New Mexico Game and Fish do not verify the training they will provide.*

Weakness #13 and weakness- *The proponents appear to be against business interests by giving away firewood.*

Mr. Dunn- going back to the idea of a precedent, there are a lot of CFRP projects that provide firewood to the elderly, etc. If the comment is included it would have to be included to every applicant; he was uncomfortable with that as a weakness.

Mr. Racher- was okay with including it to every applicant. He said the panel would see projects that do free wood and reduce rates and projects that tried to be sustainable. To compare apples to apples, he looks at projects that move toward sustainability rather than projects that will never achieve that.

Mr. Dunn- asked if income allows RMYC to become a sustainable entity what would be the difference.

Ms. Burnett- this proposal is one that works through an established mechanism that identified elderly members of the community, unlike others and that mechanism would hopefully reduce

competition with industry because they were providing it from an established organization to low income people that might not have the ability to purchase anyway.

Mr. Dunn - that sounds like a strength.

Mr. Barrone- it is a strength because the RMYC in his community helps the community because the elderly benefit.

Ms. Burnett- added detail for the strength- *The applicant works with an established community organization to distribute firewood to elderly and low income populations thereby reducing direct competition with other firewood businesses.*

Mr. Racher- added another recommendation - *A better coordination with industry could provide for a more sustainable program that places trained youth into the forest industry that complete the RMYC program.*

Mr. Barrone- RMYC already does that. The RMYC was removed from the recommendation.

Ms. Burnett- added strengths- #1, 7, 9, 10-12 and 16-19.

Mr. Barrone- added strength- *The organization has been established for more than 12 years.*

Mr. Matush- added a recommendation- *Current information is needed to see what acreage would be restored from.* He found it hard to come up with the value on the small acreage thinning projects because the current condition was not included.

Mr. Dunn- asked if the information wasn't part of the Decision Notes.

Mr. Matush- hasn't seen that in any proposals. If proponents gave the current condition and numbers it would help. He would make a recommendation because it would bring up too many weaknesses in the proposals otherwise. He wants the same kind of monitoring that would be done post thinning as what would be done pre thinning.

He approved language written by Mr. Payne.

Mr. Berrens- added strength - *As part of education and outreach, trained RMYC crews will: (1) provide fire wise presentations to community residents (2) will attend the CFRP workshops.*

Mr. Archuleta- #23 and 33 are criteria 10.

Facilitator- reminded everyone to add the criteria.

Mr. Archuleta- challenged weakness #13; the project wouldn't add to restoration efforts. He would argue that it does because of the thinning project and proposal to replant 5,000 seedlings and has long-term restoration effects. That the project provides training to youth to enter the restoration workforce market also has long-term implications.

Mr. Racher- it was okay to remove his weakness.

Mr. Pohlman- added a strength- *The project is endorsed by the District Ranger who commits to agency roles, in particular the application of prescribed fire in the project area.*

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- #28 (criteria 11) 29 (criteria 9). He added a strength- *Page six of the proposal illustrates a good workers safety process/procedure.*

Mr. Jervis- added a weakness- *All treatment is scheduled during the breeding season for birds, wildlife and pine bark beetles.* Recommendation #12 was added.

Mr. Racher- the question then becomes when the treatment could be performed. The snow drives people out in the winter; the bird breeding season; muddy and inaccessible site conditions; the beetle entries and the bug blind season all create times where there would only be six or seven days a year that the NF could be treated. He looks for a solution rather than the identification of the problem.

Mr. Jervis- August through snow season was available; several proposals state they would do treatments in the fall and winter and it was possible. This is a weakness and important to recognize that cutting in the spring was putting out the welcome mat to beetles. It wasn't fair to say there were only six or seven days.

Mr. Pohlman- this is something the Decision Officer should take into account when they sign the Decision Document and those were elements of that Decision.

Facilitator- asked Mr. Jervis if he was okay to take that out knowing it will be dealt with in the NEPA process.

Mr. Jervis- was trying to raise the level of concern so the rangers would consider it. It is a weakness and he thought this proposal was geared around the program of the youth corps. The activities happen for their convenience and pushed them to do things at a time of year that was unfortunate. There was no reason this couldn't be done in the fall.

Facilitator- the statement would be put in recommendation and the panel agreed.

Mr. Gomez- added there are mitigations.

Mr. Payne- read the language- *The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing or mitigation of ground disturbing activity treatment to account for wood needs (to protect nesting bird habitat.)*

Mr. Archuleta- this would continually come up as a weakness and part of the problem was it was vague. The weakness was they were planning activities without a plan for mitigation - no bird surveys, etc. It would help applicants understand they would score better if the level of awareness was raised.

Facilitator- that was taken out of weakness and put in recommendations with additional language.

Mr. Matush- asked that ground disturbing activity be put back in because it was in August and that was when most ground disturbing activity happened at the height of the monsoon.

Mr. Dunn- asked the Ranger for clarification.

Questa District Ranger- he was not the Ranger in 2004 when the Decision was signed. However an environmental assessment concludes all of the environmental analyses including: the reports from

the wildlife biologist, which includes all the forest plan guidelines that support wildlife and includes the biological evaluation for species on the Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List; and incorporates the biological assessment, which addresses species under the jurisdiction of the Endangered Species Act. All of those analyses were done and considered and included in the analysis in the NEPA Decision. All of the analyses were consistent with the FS plan and other requirements incorporated into that Decision signed in 2004.

Mr. Dunn- asked given that clarification, if the recommendation was still needed.

Facilitator- the language was modified to say *the land management agency and conservation group*.

Ms. Burnett- the panel was re-opening the NEPA process with the recommendation. The FS went through a publicly vetted process to develop mitigation that was part of the FONSI. Now the panel was asking the proponent to work with the land management agency and conservation groups to ensure they do things at the appropriate times.

It seems a prescription for trees to be removed and the time specific activities would take place within the project area is the FS responsibility to ensure reports and mitigation measures were followed. She was concerned with the language about working with the land management agencies and conservation groups.

Mr. Pohlman- there is a process in which change conditions could be allowed and documents could be updated. That was a call the Decision-maker has to make.

Mr. Bird- worked on several multiparty monitoring teams on CFRP projects under NEPA decisions and found a lot of flexibility in the description.

Ms. Burnett- suggested a revision that said the proponent *should work with the land management agencies and conservation groups and possibly reference the prescription process*.

After panel discussion about the revision language the panel approved the recommendation: *The proponent should work with the multi party monitoring team to develop treatments that optimize the mitigation measures for ground disturbing and thinning activities identified in the Decision to account for wildlife needs (e.g. to protect nesting bird habitat.)*

Mr. Barrone- not sure how that would apply in this application; the RMYG would go in on foot. He asked what kind of ground they could disturb.

Mr. Matush- when trees were being cut and dragged, it is disturbing.

Mr. Jervis- asked that the language be a boiler plate recommendation.

Mr. Racher-this is a larger overarching problem that couldn't be put on the proponent to fix.

Mr. Pohlman- was concerned that things would be injected on the recommendations after the Decision has been made. It would be great if the proponent worked with the multiparty monitoring team to optimize mitigations already identified in the document. He wanted to be sure what was implemented was in the Decision.

Mr. Payne- modified the recommendation language to include optimizing the existing mitigation measures identified in the Decision.

Mr. Vincent- on the previous-more information was needed on the condition of the stand of the basal area. He thought it vague.

Mr. Matush- that goes back to #6 that asked for the ecological condition to be identified. The basal area tells more about the density.

Facilitator- that is included in the language.

Ms. Fisher- to stay consistent a recommendation should be made about program income.

The panel explained the firewood was being given away and that wasn't an issue.

Mr. Dunn- said it could be added as a boiler plate recommendation.

Break- 10:33 a.m.to 10:43 a.m.

CFRP 18-11 – HR Vigil Small Products

Mr. Olivas left the room due to a conflict of interest.

Project Number:	CFRP 18-11
Organization:	Hr Vigil Small Products
Forest:	Carson, Implementation
Project Title:	Black Lake Forest Restoration, Capacity Building and Small Wood Business Sustainability
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90.000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Dan Barrone presented the information on this project.

The proponent began as a small contractor in 2002 and has since contracted three other CFRP restoration projects. The proposal would treat 350 acres of NEPA ready area that reaches across multi-jurisdictions of mixed conifer. The small diameter saplings would be eliminated to reduce the threat of high intensity wildfires. This area is in Colfax /San Miguel Counties and has been identified as a Community at Risk.

The proposed project is in a 12,000 acre parcel of state trust land which by reconstruction and change of the forest structure by the consideration of appropriate size and age of trees, and maintenance and improvement of historic meadows, will prepare the area for the re-introduction of low intensity surface fires.

The project requests $360,000 of federal, $54,318 supplied by the applicant, $19,979 by the state and $15,703 of other match totaling $450,000. The main purchase was a John Deere skidder and two log splitters. Up to 300 cords of firewood will be donated to qualified residents of the area. The project will create local employment and training opportunities for youth through educational field days and ecological monitoring; up to 10 youth will be trained in vegetative and wildlife monitoring concepts and techniques.

The project will be done in collaboration with the New Mexico State Land Office, Forest Guild, Silver Dollar Racing, Western Wood Products, Four Corners Institute, The Citizens Watershed Monitoring Team, New Mexico Wilderness Alliance and Nature Conservancy, CS Ranch and Mr. Vigil.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Bird-added strengths- #13-14, (criteria 2) - *The proponent has a related CFRP with 1000 acre burn plan under development*. Strength #33 was added- *builds on past CFRP accomplishments and plans to do more prescribed burns.*

Mr. Matush- added strengths #31, and 15.

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #1-4, 6-11, and 16-24 and added recommendations #16 and 33 regarding program income.

Mr. Racher- added strengths- *The proposal presents certificates for the FWSC which shows a commitment to the training and the safety of operators*.

Mr. Gomez- added strength # 32 and strength - *The proponent included in the proposal a multi party monitoring report from the previous CFRP grant within the vicinity of the project area.*

He asked on page 2 of the budget, that the calculations be confirmed under Item C-Travel and also on page 3 of the budget, under the wood donation to the elderly.

Mr. Dunn- added strength- *The proposed project will tie many previous CFRP projects together. The project history on page 2 provides excellent documentation of the 2008 CFRP grant accomplishments.*

Mr. Matush- added strength #12.

Mr. Barrone- added strength - *The proponent has been an established business for years.*

He added a recommendation- *The proponent is encouraged to track their tracking of donated firewood.*

Mr. Archuleta- they did a great job in the report from their previous CFRP of tracking.

Mr. Payne revised the language in the strength to say: *is encouraged to continue their excellent tracking of donated firewood.*

Mr. Matush- a lot of this is on trust land. He asked the Land Office if it was fenced off and if there was a way to manage the grazing post-thinning.

Mark, FS - there is potential to work with the lessee.

Mr. Matush- added strength- *The proponent would try to manage grazing to help the area restore itself.*

Mr. Bird- asked if it was explicit in the proposal that the proponent intends to do that.

Mr. Matush- no, they would work with the lessee.

Mr. Bird- planned to bring this up as a strength on proposals that were more explicit about it. That is an important issue when a proposal said they have adapted their grazing for the restoration.

Mr. Matush – it should be dropped, because it wasn't in the proposal.

Mr. Jervis- just as a comment- the proposal picks off two of his pet peeves; the use of the skidder and implementation in the summertime- but it is still a good proposal.

Mr. Berrens- added a strength - The proposal includes excellent multiparty monitoring report from prior CFRP grant *as an appendix.*

Mr. Gomez- added to Mr. Berrens strength- *included an excellent multiparty monitoring report.*

Mr. Pohlman- added a strength- *The proposal includes a letter of endorsement from the Forest Supervisor and the State Land Officer describing the benefits of this and similar efforts.*

Mr. Olivas returned for the next proposal.

CFRP 19-11 – Kuykendall & Sons Sawmill

There are no conflict of interest statements for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 19-11
Organization:	Kuykendall & Sons Sawmill
Forest:	Carson, Implementation
Project Title:	Maquinita Economic System Health Project
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Bob Berrens provided the overview for this proposal.

The proposal is to treat 367 acres in advance of prescribed fire in the Tres Ranger District on the Carson. The objectives are to reduce wildfire risk, reduce fuel levels, for fire to play a natural role in the system; reduce occurrence of shade tolerant trees and ponderosa pine and aspen stand and the regeneration of these species and maintain and improve old growth stands; enhance wildlife habitat through open canopy. Output will generate three cords of firewood per acre to be used by the proponent and other small businesses. Proponent expects to harvest about two and one half thousand board feet per acre and to create 5 jobs; train Mesa Vista High School and FFA students in ecological monitoring.

The proposal includes a wide variety of collaborators involved in planning, implementation and the multiparty monitoring team includes the Tres Piedras Ranger District, Carson Forest Lots, Alfonso Chacon, the volunteer fire department, Mesa Vista high school students and FFA, the New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute, Jarita Mesa Livestock Association, Armijo and Sons, MIIMSA, wood products manufacturer, Forest Guild, Amarillo Firewood, Timmy Graves Firewood Sales, and Groff Lumber.

There is specific language to maintain and improve and old growth stands; immediate thinning, strong FS in the area and strong FS letter from the ranger, the required safety training and multi-party monitoring process to measure core indicators and will have a socio-economic component. This project leverages prior CFRP grants in the area in the Ranger District and nearby El Rito area as well.

The NEPA is in place in this area and the intended result was to include reintroduction of fire to the natural cycle of the ecosystem.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Racher- added strengths-#1-4, 6-8, 17, 18, 22, 23. Administrative Observation- *the fringe benefits is based on a formula that is updated annually.*

Language from the earlier proposal (Aspen #16) was asked to be added to justify 25% for fringe benefits. The proponent did not use the universal rate.

Mr. Racher added strength - *The ecological stand descriptors give a great summary of the forest stand condition in the project areas*. (Page 1) The narrative stated the

predominance of the trees is BSS class III and IV, which are fairly large and talked about taking out saw timber.

Mr. Bird- added strength- #13 and 14 adapted from the last proposal and strength- #32 detail at the end of the sentence… *by including a local grazing association as a collaborator; however the letter of support could be strengthened with a commitment to adjust grazing management for the re-introduction of fire* (criteria 2.)

It was suggested it could be a recommendation. Mr. Bird didn't think it necessary.

Mr. Gomez- added strength #21 and language was modified after *measured… provides a very descriptive monitoring schedule.*

Strength on page 3 of the proposal- *A very good write up describing the project history.* Also strength- *Good detail maps*.

Mr. Dunn- added a weakness- *The previous CFRP grants mentioned on page 3 but the accomplishments and lessons learned from those projects or the relationship to this project is not discussed.*

Mr. Vincent- added a strength - *The* project provides for enhancement of habitat diversity through clumping in the treatment and going from even aged to uneven aged stands (page 5.)

Mr. Matush- asked clarification from the proponent Sara Kuykendall. The minimum core ecological indicators were listed and she was asked what her maximum would be.

Ms. Kuykendall- she left that open ended so when she meets with the multiparty monitoring team if they had additional comments or concerns she could add them.

Mr. Matush- added strength- #31.

Mr. Jervis- added strength- #12 and weakness- #3 (vague youth component), 9, 25, 30 and 33 and recommendations #5, 16 and 13.

Mr. Barrone- added strength- *long term established business and not only long-term but since 1978 combined with* strength #22.

Mr. Cooke- asked for clarification on page 2 and page 4, the proposal stated 2.56 million per board feet per acre…

Mr. Peralta- the million was a typographical error.

Mr. Dunn- regarding weakness #30- he understood there was no PJ. He asked for clarification from the proponent.
Mr. Kuykendall- there is no PJ.

Weakness number 30 was removed.

Ms. San Gil- supplies and equipment was a common item and she added that to Administrative.

Mr. Dunn- the panel should have an opportunity to look at the Administrative Observations.

Facilitator - Administrative Observations could be presented before the panel begins the discussion.

Mr. Matush- doesn't see anything in the proposal that stated they would *use* maintenance for fire. The proponent states they would *allow* low intensity fire to come in. Number 14 would increase the use of prescription fires and he wouldn't generally count #14 unless it was included as part of the proposal.

Mr. Bird- looked at the letter from the District Ranger-item 6 under the DR's commitment, he states "commits to treatment of activity areas with broadcast burning, etc.

Mr. Matush- if the DR included that in the letter he was okay with it.

Mr. Gomez- visited a weakness #9- page 4 of Objectives stated "this would allow for regeneration of aspen, ponderosa pine stands while improving and maintaining oak groves …and also states they would do intermediate thinning up to 12 inches."

Mr. Jervis- that's on one unit, another unit they don't state that.

Mr. Gomez- this covers the project area of 367 acres.

It was pointed out that it was also included on the Executive Summary on page 1 of 9.

Mr. Jervis- was under the impression from the Decision Notice the proponent was taking off a fair amount of saw timber. Clarification was asked from the proponent.

Questa FS- clarified the typo on the million board feet. He addressed the question on old growth- a lot of the stands are designated through the NEPA to improve and retain old growth basically removing the smaller diameter trees that contribute to competition.

Also FS tries to preserve the larger remnant trees in the stands by removing small diameter product. This size would vary from each stand but prescriptions would be developed more specifically later.

Mr. Jervis- asked the Ranger if the limit stated in the proposal "no trees larger than 12 inches" applied across the entire project.

FS- it isn't across the entire project area; it was designated stand areas.

Mr. Dunn- a statement on page 2 mentions who will benefit and how and one bullet point was to preserve old and large trees. On Page 3 again it was mentioned in the third paragraph; "increased wildlife habitat and improving and maintaining old growth stands" and again at the bottom of page 4, stated intermediate thinning up to 12 inches...

Mr. Jervis- his problem was larger trees were coming out.

FS- confirmed that larger trees would come out, especially when VSS 3 and 4 were addressed.

Mr. Jervis- wants to leave that in.

Mr. Dunn- the application does include provisions for preserving old and large trees.

FS- District Ranger for Très Piedras- the objective states "*and* intermediate thinning up to 12 inch DBA" and that was not exclusively thinning up to 12 inches.

Mr. Jervis- doesn't have a problem with intermediate thinning; he has a problem with taking larger trees out. There is inconsistency in stating that nothing would be taken larger than 12 inches and that big trees would be removed.

Mr. Dunn- If there was an issue of inconsistency the inconsistencies should be highlighted. The application includes provisions for preserving old and large trees.

FS- the FS to preserve old-growth would need to remove some of those trees in some stands and had to do treatments to aspen stands as well.

Mr. Dunn- over the years after panel discussion in a situation like that, funding has been approved.

Mr. Jervis- it was important to recognize they were going to cut old trees. Mr. Jervis read the language on #9: *There is an inconsistency with the application provision for preserving old and large trees and the FS decision memo that anticipates taking larger trees out.*

Panel discussed that another application had the same discussion and it remained as a weakness but was classified in the Decision Memo they would take them out; specifically white fir.

Facilitator- this is in the weakness and the language was changed.

Mr. Pohlman- added as strength- *The proposal includes a support letter from the District Ranger committing to project assistance and post project prescribed fire.*

An Administrative Observation was about a skidder in the budget being purchased in year two and a skidder that shows as nonfederal in year three. He asked for clarification from the proponent that this skidder was not the same one.

Mr. Peralta- that information was picked up in the review and discussed with the proponent. The skidder that is already in place will remain in place for year three and no match will come out for the purchased skidder.

Mr. Payne- asked if that was the reason for the inconsistency in fuel from 23 gallons per day to 140 gallons per day.

Ms. Kuykendall- part of that was in earlier years from them purchasing the fuel and why there was a major inconsistency in the numbers; this fuel is part of the match and didn't show it.

Ms. San Gil- noted that the project income was being put under recommendations.

Facilitator- confirmed that #33, the application and budget has been under recommendations.

Lunch- 11: 45 a.m. - 1:15 p.m.

Public Comment Period

Mr. Dunn read a letter into record received from Anthony Madrid, Canjilon District Ranger, to the CFRP Advisory Panel:

My name is Anthony Madrid. I am the new District Ranger on the Canjilon Ranger District of the Carson NF. I did not have an opportunity to provide input on proposal 20-11 but I have reviewed the proposal and met with the applicant several times. I support the project and would like to add a couple of comments.

1. The project site is not within a heavily forested area but rather in the sagebrush country. Please do not discount this project because it is in the sagebrush. Sagebrush areas are extremely important to the Carson, almost 10% of our landmass is sagebrush country. These areas provide significant forage in habitat for wildlife and domestic stock, especially wintering wildlife. This project is an excellent watershed restoration project with multiple improvements (brushhogging, seeding, water development and road de-commissioning.)

2. Also, I do not want you folks to minimize the potential for wildfire in the sagebrush country. The Carson has multiple fires within the sagebrush country every year. By treating the sagebrush, this project will reduce the potential for wildfire and in case of a fire, it will reduce intensity and flame length. This project site is surrounded by heavily treated forested PJ. In case of a fire this area could serve as a firebreak or safety zone.

The Canjilon RD fully supports this project.

Signed Anthony Madrid, Canjilon District Ranger

Review of Applications- CFRP 20-11, 21-11 Rev. 1, CFRP 23-11

CFRP 20-11 – Amigos Del Bosque, Llc

There were no conflicts of interests noted for this project.

Project Number:	CFRP 20-11
Organization:	Amigos Del Bosque, LLC
Forest:	Implementation Carson
Project Title:	Eco-System Restoration on Mesa Juan Domingo-Canjilon Road
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Bryan Bird gave an overview of this project.

The proponent's authorized representative is Maurice Torres and this is a three year project. The project is unique in that it looks at a watershed approach to restoration. The proponent wants to open up 400 acres of sagebrush restoration, so it wouldn't burn as hot and as fast and re-establish grasslands in the sagebrush; establish drinkers for wildlife and do 5 miles of road de-commissioning. Another unique aspect is the proponent discusses a Carson forest-wide monitoring counsel which would put all of the CFRPs on the Carson together to discuss better organization and collaboration and mutually work together to enhance the projects.

No product is produced in this proposal but safety and fire prevention training will be provided for everyone. The YCC is involved and discussed soil erosion abatement etc. and was committed to restoring fire into the economic system. The proponent has a long history of implementing CFRP projects in the Carson and has proven capabilities.

Panel Discussion

The Administrative Observations were shown to the panel.

Mr. Matush- asked for clarification of how the reseeding would be applied.

FS- the seed would be provided by Carson NF and would be broadcast. They won't roll over the seed.

Mr. Matush- asked if on the drinkers (tanks) on page 3, the 1,075 referred to what he was cleaning on the dams (catchments) or was it the size of the dam.

FS- that was the estimated costs- they were trick tanks.

Mr. Jervis- clarified with the DR on the project in the 1960's- would the stocking rates and grazing management on the area be changed after the project or would they continue to do monoculture sagebrush.

Juan Martinez, wildlife biologist- in the 60s they chained and seeded and nothing was done to maintain that and was the reason the sagebrush came back. They would not try to get rid of all of the

sagebrush but would do more of a mosaic pattern for wildlife grazing and change the rotation to allow the pastures to rest.

Mr. Matush- asked for clarification on the seed mix.

Mr. Martinez- work with Game and Fish is being done to develop that and a combination of forbs and grasses would be put in for the deer. The cool season would be emphasized because the residual warm season grasses are there.

Mr. Matush- asked why tebuthiuron was not being used.

FS- an EIS would have to be done and it was discussed as a possibility in the future.

Mr. Barrone- asked for clarification from FS if NEPA was complete. He was told it was.

Mr. Racher- added strengths- #6, and 16. He added weakness #16 and #22 with detail- *A portion of the project was for collaboration on multiparty monitoring on the Carson and he would like more definition for that. The milestones associated with the multiparty monitoring group are vague*.

Ms. Fisher- added strengths- #16, 29 and 32.

Mr. Jervis- added strength - #15 and weakness # 5 (The collaborator's letters do not verify match.)

He added weakness- #19 and 30; not reflected in the proposal.

He added the recommendation on seasonality #16.

Weakness detail was added on #10- *The ecological role of fire in the sage brush systems is complex and is not reflected in the proposal.*

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- *Very good detail maps*. To weakness #19- *The monitoring and evaluation plan is confusing on what exactly would be collected and provided as a deliverable*.

Mr. Cooke- commented that the proposal was unique to improve the use and add value to land or trees and to leave them for diversity within the grasslands that would be created. That was a different paradigm than normal.

Ms. Burnett- added a weakness- #2 and detail *the conservation group*, and weakness number #3.

Mr. Matush- asked if there would be a rest rotation after treatment; it appears to span 45 sections. He asked if that was one pasture.

Mr. Martinez- wasn't sure the range management came up with a plan for rotation. It expanded over two pastures.

Mr. Dunn- regarding weakness #5- the match was all from the applicant and they were the one submitting the 424 so no other information is required.

Ms. Burnett- didn't see that; it might be that the letter that didn't verify the commitments in the proposal (partner's roles.)

She stated there was- *no letter from a specific YCC committing to participation to manage the YCC component.*

Mr. Bird- regarding weakness #16, the executive summary states the safety and fire prevention training is provided for everyone involved in the project. It also refers to it on page 8 in the three-year work plan.

Mr. Racher was okay with weakness #16 being removed.

Ms. Watson- asked the proponent (Louis) if there was livestock grazing currently and was told there was.

She added weakness #2- The proponent should have collaborated with the livestock owners.

The panel pointed out the proponent *did* collaborate; there was a letter from Victor Salazar.

Mr. Archuleta-added strengths- #1 with language (criteria #5) - *The proponent should be commended for including a Mutual Domestic Water Association (MDWA) for two reasons: 1) as a community governance structure in the absence of a formal local government entity*. 2*) With regard to the relationship between the community drinking water system and the watershed health on public lands.*

Also strength #22 (criteria 10.)

Mr. Jervis- thought it a contradiction between what Mr. Archuleta said…includes a diverse and balanced group of partners… It was not consistent with weakness #2 and the #1 strength.

Mr. Archuleta- there could be a strength that adds to the value that there was a balanced group of partners but could also be a weakness that determined how to score that. He thought the weakness was also related to criteria #5 but that would be up to the panel to decide the rating. It was okay to have both and makes sense for the panel to codify where they are and where they fit in, based on the 1-5.

Mr. Jervis- he was okay with that but wasn't sure Mr. Dunn could explain it.

Mr. Dunn- thought it was possible to say there was a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders. But to say there is a particular stakeholder that is part of this would be a good idea.

Mr. Pohlman- as an item of consistency between weakness #10 and strength #13- they seem to be mutually exclusive. There wasn’t a lot of discussion of fire in the proposal and that was needed in order to have #32.

Mr. Jervis- suggested they address the interaction between grazing and sagebrush restoration efforts.

The language was changed to read: *The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and sagebrush restoration effectors.*

Mr. Pohlman- added a strength - *The Carson NF provided letters of support that confirm NEPA is complete in pledging project collaboration.*

Mr. Matush- added a recommendation- *The project would be enhanced if it included more data on the condition on how much grass and brush existed currently.*

Mr. Racher- recommendation # 6 was added and modified- *The forest wide multiparty monitoring referred back to the weakness…*

CFRP 21-11 – Mr. John H. Brown

Ms. Burnett left the room for this proposal due to a conflict of interest.

Project Number:	CFRP 21-11
Organization:	Mr. John H. Brown
Forest:	Implementation,
Project Title:	Making Stewardship Successful for the Community of Tres Piedras and Northern New Mexico
Funding Requested:	$258,199
Matching Funds:	$53,420
Total Budget:	$311,619

Mr. Archuleta provided an overview of this project.

The purpose of the project is to treat 275 acres of NEPA approved FS land in Tres Piedras. The project is for three years and would result in 8 new jobs during the grant period. The wood products harvested would be marketed locally and sold to the regional markets; firewood would be purchased at $25 a cord. The project would add significant capacity for the business to continue to provide stewardship contracts in the future for that area.

The project partners are Mountain Tech, USFS, Tres Piedras Ranger District, the New Mexico State Forestry, the Chama District, Pueblo of Santa Clara, the 4-H Club and the SWCA Environmental concerns.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush- added strengths- #9 (reduces fire risk on page 2.)

Mr. Barrone- added strengths- #2, 6, 7, 10, 12-18 and weakness #4- missing letters from Cow Creek Ranch, Santa Fe Firewood & Forest Guild.

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #22- 24, 27, 29, 31and 32 and weaknesses- # 3, 8, 9, 19 and 30.

Mr. Bird- objected to weakness #30. Mr. Jervis agreed to omit #30.

Facilitator- asked for detail from Mr. Jervis on #19- *The monitoring and evaluation plan lists the core indicators that will be measured and that SWCA will do this but appears there are only 2 parties involved in the multi-party effort.*

Mr. Racher- monitoring could be done by a single entity but there has to be a multiparty that would oversee the project.

Mr. Payne- or they could design what could be monitored and contract the monitoring for the actual data collection.

Mr. Jervis- there was nothing in the section on the monitoring/evaluation plan that says anything about multiparty interest groups.

Mr. Olivas- there is a contradiction between strength # 15 and #9 weakness. He read the sentence where it was included on page 1 of the first paragraph.

Mr. Jervis- didn't mean to add weakness #10; that was basically a WUI issue and he wasn't sure they would introduce fire in that area.

There was no discussion of the ecological role of fire in the management plan. He asked weakness #10 be removed and to add instead weakness #9.

Mr. Pohlman- there was discussion of fire in NEPA and a commitment for burning in the letter that was provided from FS. It was pointed out that was not a discussion of the ecological role.

Weakness #10 was left in.

Mr. Dunn- added weakness - *Page 5 of the narrative indicates a prescription will be developed in accordance with the guidelines for restoring forest in the Southwest as developed by ERI. It is not clear how that would be accomplished and there is no reference to the ERI document in the NEPA Decision Notice.*

He asked a question of the FS- the reference on page 5 on the Stewardship Contracting- he didn't understand the relation about the stewardship contracting to the CFRP. It implies CFRP is a stewardship contractor, which it isn't.

Juan Martinez- they were trying to get a way to use the small diameter wood for local and useful purposes.

Mr. Peralta- the last 3 lines was what NEPA alluded to that has nothing to do with stewardship contracting and the CFRP, other than creating the capacity for John Brown as a company to be situated to do stewardship contracting for the FS.

Mr. Dunn- the comment could be omitted.

Mr. Matush- wanted to withdraw the strength on high risk community- he projected again. He realized after he got to the map it was miles from any known high risk community.

Mr. Gomez- added strength- *Good detail maps*. The proponent was asked - on page 1 it said "value added to small damaged timber sales would be enhanced using an approach where products are sold from roadside locations within the treatment areas"; how would that would work.

Mr. Brown- he has an agreement with Santa Fe Wood to buy from him and has permission for the use of their saw mill in Tres Piedras. Carson would issue permits to him and included that in their letter of recommendation.

Mr. Gomez- added a strength- *The volume from the project area would be removed in a timely manner and the proponent has made arrangements for removing the volume.*

Mr. Vincent- in regard to weakness #10, there is mention of the ecological role of fire. If it's an old growth stand of 200 ft.^{2} of basal area, nothing would be done with that. He read from page 7 "ponderosa pine stands with basal often exceeding 200 square feet... stands remain in these conditions and fire entering these areas will result in stand replacement fire."

Mr. Jervis- the basil area is indicative but not complete. He could imagine a basal area less than that with thousands of stems per acre. It states trees in there were more than 12 inches and he was inclined to think that is not old growth and if that kind of basal area is in a stand that was mostly trees less than 12 inches, it was dense.

Weakness #10 was not removed.

Mr. Racher- asked to talk to the FS from that district.

FS- there were not many trees that were greater than 12 inches in the area; in the old growth system there were larger diameter trees and it would have a lot of age classes. The FS was trying to remove density. The 12 inch diameter comes up in the Decision on number 2 tree thinning. It isn't dominated by cultured trees.

Mr. Dunn- for reference, the language "old and large" in the Act, was the idea to try to preserve old and large for a number of reasons. There could be old trees you wouldn't want to preserve and large trees that were not very old. Old growth-the idea is to try to preserve old and large trees.

Mr. Racher- added to weakness #2 - There was no letter that demonstrated collaboration with the *conservation groups* was *added.*

He had questions about the budget; there was no money in year two for monitoring. He asked if there should be between year one and two.

Mr. Jervis- two pieces were missing; the boilerplate recommendation- #16 on the program income.

Mr. Racher- asked if it was a weakness that the monitoring was not budgeted in year 2 of the project. It is listed in the work plan but it is not included in the budget.

Mr. Archuleta- asked if CFRP could require the program to have monitoring on an annual basis.

Mr. Berrens- it stated in the timeline that monitoring would continue and expand in year two. A weakness was that monitoring for *year two was not included in the budget*.

Mr. Racher- added a weakness- on page 6 a portion of the grant funds would be used for a field trip for the 4H Club and it isn't in the budget; the budget and the work plan do not correspond.

Mr. Dunn- read from the RFA regarding budgeting and multiparty monitoring.

Mr. Archuleta- Because monitoring is done in year two doesn't mean it had to be built into that year. Sometimes the work was priority and an agreement was made with the contractor to charge monitoring after that period passed. He asked for clarification from the applicant.

Mr. Brown- that was what he tried to do.
Mr. Archuleta- it was a cost but not a cost in the second year; it would be billed in year three. If there was a detail on the quote it could be tested by looking at the total quote costs.

Mr. Racher- added to the weakness *that if more detail was provided on the quote on the monitoring it would have helped clear up the confusion*.

The panel agreed with the language presented.

Mr. Pohlman- added language for a strength- *The proposal included a letter of support from the District Ranger that commits to roles, especially post-project prescribed fire.*

Mr. Jervis- added a weakness- *A letter of commitment from SWCA does not include a budget or work plan.*

Ms. Burnett returned to the room for Proposal CFRB 22-11

CFRP 22-11 Rev 1 – Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products

There was no conflict of interests noted for this project.

Project Number:	CFRP 22-11 Rev. 1
Organization:	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products
Forest:	Carson, Implementation
Project Title:	Quality Environment and Economic Sustainability Project – Phase 11
Funding Requested:	$342,000
Matching Funds:	$85,500
Total Budget:	$427,500
Evaluation Category	

Dick Cooke provided the overview for this project.

The proponent is Rudy Jaramillo and this was phase II of the project. The project has a strong letter of support from the DR that addresses the threat of wildfire and watershed integrity and aiding prescribed burns; however the letter did not to commit to burning following the project.

The project would buy equipment: a grapple loader and log loader. The plan was originally for 300 acres and was funded partially the previous year and 120 acres was done. This proposal was for the 180 acres remaining this year. The DR's letter stated the other project has been started and the proponent has met the due dates.

Jaramillo and Sons would do the treatment and the primary products would be latillas, vigas and firewood and some logs would be cut and sold to Kuykendall Saw Mill. Six seasonal jobs would be created and safety training will be provided by Gilbert Vigil. One priority was the removal of mistletoe infested trees for forest health.

There are 22 collaborators; the project has a multi-party monitoring plan and includes students from New Mexico Highlands in the Mesa District and would be coordinated by Gilbert Vigil to collect and monitor baseline data for their utilization plan. Their marketing plan is complete with program income and is included in the packet.

Five problem areas include fire risk, forest health, watershed and water resources, the return of surface fire and the economy of areas. The DR's letter states that the grant allows these projects to be done earlier than if it was done under the current economic status of the areas.

Panel Discussion

Ms. Burnett- asked if the proponent submitted an application for 300 acres last year for the total amount that was partially funded and this year requested the total amount to finish the remaining portion.

Mr. Cooke- they requested close to the full amount.

The proponent was asked to clarify.

Rudy Jaramillo, proponent- - in working on the budget and the numbers on the acres he found it difficult to bring the cost down. His intention was to ask the Forest Service for more acreage to be treated to compensate for that; if things went as planned. Even now he proposed $4 for the cost of diesel and the cost was currently way above that.

Ms. Burnett- it sounds as though conditions have changed from last year to this and the cost has increased.

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- #6-10, and 12-24. Strength with language on page #7- *The proponent has established markets and arranged to deliver the forest product from the project.*

Also strength - *The price amounts for the forest products have been identified.*

Strength- *Excellent maps identifying proposed area of treatment and the locations of past and ongoing CFRP projects within vicinity of the proposed project.*

A recommendation was added- *The budget doesn't identify what was included in the fringe benefits.*

Mr. Racher- asked on the recommendation; this project talks about the formula that they update annually but it doesn't describe what is in it or what part of WC it was. He asked the proponent what rate of workers comp he was paying currently.

Mr. Jaramillo - doesn't remember the numbers but thought it was 16%.

Language was added to the recommendation- *To verify that written financial management support fringe benefits.*

Mr. Dunn- there could be other proposals where that would be appropriate.

Mr. Bird- added strengths- #32 with language- *Two grazing associations were listed as collaborators with letters of commitment and one to be on the multiparty monitoring team with letters of commitment.*

Strength #33 was also added.

Ms. Burnett- added strengths- #1-4 and 6-8.

Mr. Jervis- added weaknesses- #9, 17 and 18- *it was unclear as to how much of the treatment area is pre-commercial thin or how much is saw timber*. Recommendation #16- *the proponent should work with the multi-party monitoring team…*

Ms. Burnett- some language was in the proposal regarding *old and large* trees. Page 5 states that old and large trees were protected but on page 2 of the Decision Notice there was discussion on the diameter. That was discussed in an earlier proposal and she suggested language be used from that.

The application does include provisions on preserving old and large trees. Clarification was asked from the FS.

FS- a lot of the treatment areas were set up for pre-commercial thinning and saw timber. Different aspects of group selection were incorporated and other areas were identified for mistletoe control thinning. Many of the areas were designated based on forest health issues. There will be larger

trees that were larger diameter that were protected as well as some that were severely diseased up to 18 inches that would be taken out.

Mr. Racher- the proponents were working within a larger NEPA decision. He wanted to concentrate on the proposal and not the broader NEPA.

Ms. Burnett- that has been discussed in an earlier proposal and that language could be pulled for this proposal.

FS- they were basically in the pre-commercial pinion stage and would focus more on smaller trees, more specific to the project area. This project would be pre-commercial thinning. It does allow for some group selection but that was not a major component.

Mr. Bird- wanted to be sure Ms. Burnett's point was addressed; there was language in a previous proposal.

Mr. Jervis- in the past proposal it was left as a weakness because some larger trees would be cut.

Mr. Bird- added that he has worked with all of the operators over the last five years on various multi-party monitoring teams and has experienced very careful and very thoughtful tree cutting. Some larger mistletoe trees were taken and that was where the saw timber came from. He would vouch for their good work.

Ms. San Gil- offered to pull up the language from the previous proposal.

Mr. Archuleta- it's important to qualify what Mr. Racher said- sometimes the Decision Memo was larger than the project. There could be contrast between the two but they could be separate activities.

Mr. Jervis- would remove weakness #9.

Ms. Burnett- asked Mr. Jervis what he wanted to see in the future so this problem wouldn't be continued. She asked what else the proponent could do.

Mr. Jervis- if the NEPA for the project was specific he would feel better. The Forest Service is approving the projects and he sees projects that sound like timber sales that he saw in the 80s. It was easy to say they would preserve old and large trees, but if the prescriptions and NEPA documentation doesn't support that, they shouldn't say that.

Mr. Archuleta- one, he wanted clarification on the legislation. He understood that part of it was to preserve old and large trees but it wasn't to preserve *all* old and large trees. The NEPA is a larger document and they might need clarification from the FS.

Mr. Peralta, FS- they have done extensive work and he would reiterate what was said by Mr. Bird that this is the pre-commercial of the NEPA document and not the timber sale portion, which would be done under a different category. He has walked the stands and it was a difference of leaving a few infected trees to ruin the whole stand or selecting the larger trees to protect the whole stand. It was about improving the ecosystem and forest health.

Mr. Jervis- recognizes that but he wished the proposal said that. He said there was an inconsistency between the proposal and the NEPA.

Mr. Dunn- in response to Mr. Archuleta on one hand the first two purposes of the CFRP was to promote healthy watershed and reduce the threat of large high intensity wildfires, insect infestation and disease in New Mexico forests. Number two, was to improve the forest ecosystem and enhance plant and wildlife bio-diversity by reducing the unnatural high number and density small diameter trees.

The last purpose is to develop, demonstrate and evaluate ecologically sound forest restoration techniques. There was in addition an eligibility requirement to preserve old and large trees; so there was a lot of gray.

The question becomes what were the site specific conditions. Some situations could be that the old and large trees would have to be addressed. Another challenge is the language used in NEPA documents still uses terms like pre-commercial thinning and hasn't caught up to the language of forest restoration.

Mr. Gomez- this should not be a weakness for the proponent if it was in the NEPA document. The proponent shouldn't be penalized.

Ms. San Gil- for a proposal to have a weakness meant that the proponent would have to address the issue in writing if the project was funded. She could see no problem with this being included; if the project is funded the issue would be added in writing to be addressed by the proponent.

Mr. Berrens- the issue has come up on a variety of projects. His concern is that all of the mismatch with NEPA projects would be treated the same.

Mr. Dunn- this discussion is one of a number of reasons why CFRP sees planning proposals.

Ms. Burnett- if the applicant hadn't addressed the matter on page 5 she wouldn't have had a problem. The proponent has already said they would ensure preservation of old and large trees, what else could they say; so why leave this as a weakness.

The weakness was pulled.

Mr. Vincent- added a strength - *The use of the* fellow buncher *should increase productivity thus enhancing the economic feasibility and the use of small diameter trees.*

Mr. Cooke- added a strength- *The proposal contains a letter of support from the District Ranger acknowledging the project contribution to forest restoration.* The NEPA does include that they would come in and burn and the letter insinuates that the activities would be necessary prior to burning.

Mr. Pohlman- added a strength- *The proposal contains a letter of support from the DR acknowledging project's contribution to forest restoration.* He added that the letter doesn't state they would come in to burn but it was in the NEPA and the letter mentions the activities are necessary prior to burning.

Break- 3:00 p.m. - 3:09 p.m.

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

CFRP 23-11 – Alfonso Chacon III Forest Enterprises

Mr. Bird left the room due to a conflict of interest.

Project Number:	CFRP 23-11
Organization:	Alfonso Chacon III Forest Enterprises
Forest:	Carson, Implementation
Project Title:	Healthy Forests/Healthy Communities in the Vallecitos
Funding Requested:	$359,450
Matching Funds:	$90,550
Total Budget:	$450,000

Shaun Fisher provided an overview of the project.

The project is an implementation proposal located in Vallecitos in the Carson NF in Rio Arriba County. The project would treat 330 NEPA ready acres and the project area represents the diversity of vegetation types including even and uneven aged stands of ponderosa pine, aspen and mixed conifer. The ecological process would promote forage for livestock and undulates. Forest Guild and Wild Earth Guardians will guide the prescriptions and monitor the results as part of a longer term partnership with the El Rito Ranger District.

Students from the Mesa Vista Consolidated School District, middle school and high school will team with New Mexico college students to receive hands on learning and application opportunities in monitoring and evaluation. The Chacon and Sons have received three CFRP grants (2005, 2008, and 2010.) His workers are safety certified under the NMFWSC program.

The proponent has a large array of collaborators among which are Carson NF, The Forest Guild, New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute, Wild Earth Guardians, NMFD, Mesa Vista Consolidated Schools, Northern New Mexico College, W.H. Moore Cash Lumber, Kuykendall and Sons Saw Mill, Jarita Mesa El Rito Cattleman Association, Alamos and Escondido Livestock, La Asociacion de Rio Vallecitos, Jose Montoya Accounting Services, New Mexico Forest Industries Association, Kit Carson Electric Cooperative, Northern Rio Grande RC&D Council, Northern New Mexico Stockman's Association, Rocky Mount Ecology, Chacon and Sons and Joe Gurule & Son.

The project will hire two experienced chain saw operators and three laborers in the first year and in the third year a post peeler and a backhoe operator. CFRP grants have funded two small family based businesses that are successfully marketing small diameter wood products.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Racher- the proponent included rates at 12.65% plus the WC and separated that and showed the different rates, which was great to see. A fringe ranged from 29% to 49% depending on job description and that is important to see in comparison to the other projects.

He added a strength- *The WC rates appear to be in line with the current rates.*

Strengths- #1-4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17 and weaknesses #3 and 6.

Mr. Dunn- added strength - *The treatment will be followed by prescribed fire controlled burn which will re-establish historic fire regime.*

And strength- *The proposal (page 2) incorporates the stand data collected from a previous CFRP multi-party monitoring effort.*

A third strength- *The proposed treatment is in one of the three most at risk watersheds in the Carson NF (page 2-the Rio Vallecitos Watershed.)*

Mr. Matush- that was a strength for the Carson; as far as impaired waters, it wasn't an issue. He added strengths- #31, 7 and 22.

Mr. Olivas- added strength- #9, 15, 23-24, 28 and 29.

Mr. Gomez- strength #8 has a contradiction- it has a weakness #3- *the youth component lacks detail* but also was noted as a strength #8- includes a good youth component.

Mr. Dunn- page 7, fourth paragraph stated that the school district has committed 20 students to participate in the monitoring/data gathering process.

Weakness #3 was removed.

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- #18, 20-21 and 28 and weakness #8 - *The map shows 278 acres but they were treating 338 acres and the map was missing an area or should have a second map.*

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #12, 32 and 33 and weakness #17 and 18.

He added recommendation #33 on the administrative issue on program income.

Language was asked for #18 and Mr. Jervis said it was okay to remove the weakness because it overlapped #17.

Ms. Burnett- at the bottom of page 6 there was a statement about estimated income but she did not see that in the budget.

Language was added for a recommendation- *The program income related to the federal grant should be reflected in the budget.*

Mr. Jervis- added recommendations #5, 13, and 16 and strength #14. He then asked #13 to be dropped.

Mr. Cooke- added strength- *The proposal integrates grazing permitees into small diameter utilization and post project burning discussions.*

Mr. Racher- asked a process question- The RFP states that documentation of the consultation with the tribes must be attached; and there was nothing. He would think about wording for that.

Ms. Burnett- the applicant should include more detail about the stream crossing improvements referenced. She didn’t want it to be a weakness because it is a good idea and she liked the idea that access would be improved.

She made a recommendation- *The proposal would be strengthened by including more detail about the stream crossing improvements on page six.*

Mr. Racher- asked the FS if they were working with engineering to improve stream crossings.

Mr. Peralta- they were working with engineering and that was the only way that could be done.

Ms. Burnett- asked on recommendation #16- it was a good recommendation but the proponent has a statement about the Forest Guild and Wild Earth Guardians would value prescriptions and monitor the results to ensure ecological integrity… She asked if that recommendation needs to be applied to *this* proposal since they have committed to that already.

Mr. Jervis- that recommendation was his and he wanted to see that stated; that was broader than just the two species. Ms. Burnett said that was fine.

Mr. Dunn- the weakness regarding income was in the wrong place and should be moved to a recommendation. There is income on page 11 of the budget reflected as more lumber as well as Alamosa Cattlemen Association would purchase more lumber and was reflected as a non federal match. He said that was a good way to deal with the income.

Mr. Olivas- on page 7 in the first sentence on the top of the narrative- would the income go into the budget. He was told it would.

Mr. Jervis- was confused where the money would go.

Mr. Dunn- there was a number of ways that could be dealt with. One way to deal with program income was to use it to offset the non federal match and if spent on the project it doesn't have to be specifically called out in the expenses.

Ms. San Gil- it could be added to the project or reduce the federal portion or the non federal portion or reduce both equally.

Mr. Berrens- on page 3 it stated in the narrative that revenue generation through sales has resulted in treating additional acreage at no cost to the FS on prior CFRP.

He asked the FS, if counting the revenue as part of the match was not accounted for in the acreage.

Mr. Peralta- yes that happened on several of the grants and generally the FS would ask that additional acres be done with those dollars and that has been done.

Mr. Berrens- asked for a percentage of the additional acreage that has happened on prior grants.

Mr. Peralta- 40 extra acres had been done on Alfonso's project in addition to what was in the proposal. The forester would identify additional acreage next to the project site and continue with the project area.

Mr. Dunn- asked for clarification on the letters with tribes.

Mr. Peralta- he was told by the grant writer that letters went out and the proponent failed to put them in the package. They were currently trying to get a list of people the letters went to and the date they were sent. He identified that as a weakness also when he did his review of the project.

Mr. Berrens- added a strength - *The program is receiving good value for the grant expenditures.* He gave an example of accounting costs that many projects don't break out. The rates were not above $50 an hour except for one which included an indirect rate. He was impressed and thought it was a good value.

Mr. Pohlman- asked that the previous strength language regarding the DR letter be inserted into this proposal.

Ms. Watson- in the future, regarding letters to the tribes, she would like a boilerplate language- *The proponent did not submit letters to tribes in the proposal.* She was told there was a weakness #6 that said that. She asked that be added to the boilerplate that said *letters* of support.

Mr. Dunn- a stack of letters was just handed to him and dated in February and obviously the proponent failed to put the letters into the proposal.

Facilitator- asked because the letters had been done if the weakness should be removed.

Mr. Dunn- no, the way it was stated was accurate; the application did not include the letters.

Ms. Fisher- asked for clarification from the proponent regarding the line that said there would be some removal of mature aspen- if that was per NEPA.

Ranger- yes, as far as NEPA is concerned, aspen is considered part of that and there were also small patches of the aspen, not large stands, that were not in good shape that need to be addressed.

Ms. Fisher– recommended the language used previously about the conflict between the NEPA and the large and old trees.

Facilitator- that language was removed.

Ms. San Gil- said it was only taken out of one proposal.

Ms. Burnett- the language was something to the effect that there was a conflict between the proposal and the NEPA document on the preservation of old and large trees.

Ms. San Gil- that language was in project 19 as a weakness.

Mr. Pohlman- on page 5 it was mentioned that they protect older and larger trees and thinning will occur only on trees up to 12 inches in diameter. While he was looking at the NEPA document he found they would regenerate approximately 25 acres of aspen.

Facilitator- confirmed a strength was that the proposal protects old growth and should not be in the weaknesses.

Ms. Fisher- was okay with that.

Panel Discussion on Scoring:

Mr. Dunn- the panel had agreed on the point that a member who was not present (other than for a conflict of interest) should not be a part of the scoring because they were not part of the discussion.

Mr. Racher- he thought members *should* be allowed. They could look at the strengths and weaknesses and see the discussion and could read the proposal. For consistency, if the member doesn't feel they could score they could remove themselves from submitting a score but the person should be allowed to score.

Ms. Burnett- part of the reason the panel agreed as a group to re-score was the value of the discussion. People who were not present might have questions they could not ask the applicant, etc. and they wouldn't have the ability to have questions answered. It would be a hybrid of what the panel did previously. The panel now took the mean and not a cumulative score and it wouldn't be a big deal that a member couldn't score a proposal if not present for discussion because the scores would be divided by a lesser number of people.

Mr. Dunn- clarified that if a member of panel was not present for discussion they should not submit scores.

Mr. Archuleta- was okay with not voting (scoring) but for future reference; he went through the strengths and weaknesses of the three projects he missed and codified them based on the criteria. He was okay if they weren't counted but thought it would help to codify the strengths and weaknesses by the criteria.

Mr. Payne- was okay either way; the formula would be to divide the scores by the number of those present. If the panel wanted to stick to the discussion and participate in the discussion he was okay with the panel doing that.

Mr. Olivas- was okay with weeding out a member that wasn't present and not include them in the scoring.

Mr. Dunn- seems that for the value of the panel discussion, the most consistent case was the panel would not include scores for people who were not part of the discussion.

Mr. Olivas- clarified someone who recused themselves would not be included just like those who were not present.

Mr. Racher- the discussion on strengths and weaknesses were put up and down based on different observations but at the end of the day the scores were individual done. Even the people who were not in the room and didn't participate in the discussion could still individually score based on looking at the strengths and weaknesses. What it takes out is the error of an individual missing something that might determine their score.

Mr. Olivas- the panel chose to change the process the first day and Mr. Racher was trying to combine the processes. The process he used was utilizing the score sheet he prepared before the discussion and he only changed a handful. He said for people not present they don't have the opportunity to have the discussion.

Mr. Barrone- either way he could live with it, but he received a packet with all of the strengths and weaknesses and the recommendations and could go through that, take his original score sheet and change scores if he needed to. He felt he could score things because everything discussed was there.

Mr. Berrens- either way was fine but he preferred only to count scores of the people who were present. A big part of being a panel member was an obligation to the proponent and the people in the audience. He understood not being able to be there but part of this was to do their due diligence. He would vote to only count the scores of those present.

Ms. Watson- a list was given to her when she was out and she compared that with what she rated in the beginning and as they went along and the scores were similar. It was fine if her scores were not counted.

Facilitator- it sounded as though people in general would exclude those who were not present to ensure the discussion in the room was focused.

Mr. Dunn- that is the most consistent with the philosophical argument the panel had on the first day about why they were doing the re-score. There is a value to the actual discussion above and beyond what gets written down.

Mr. Archuleta- also just for consistency, scores shouldn't be counted if a person is not in the room.

CFRP 24-11 – Jo Gurule & Son

There was no conflict of interest for this project.

Project Number:	CFRP 24-11
Organization:	Joe Gurule & Son
Forest:	Carson
Project Title:	Forest Restoration & Education in the Agua Caballos
Funding Requested:	$359,922
Matching Funds:	$90,056
Total Budget:	$449,978

Danny Gomez provided an overview of the project.

The match share is 25% over the required 20%. The project is NEPA approved and the location is in the Vallecitos Federal Sustained Yield unit in the El Rito Ranger District in the Carson NF in Rio Arriba County. The treatments was to hand chainsaw thin approximately 300 acres along Road 106 of small of ponderosa pine, pinion pine and juniper to treat diseased trees, reduce ladder fuels and open up the stand to promote forest healthy regeneration. An additional 43 acres would be prepped for prescribed burn. A used backhoe will be purchased for more rugged terrain. Small diameter material, mainly firewood, would be removed from the treated areas. The project site will be used for environmental and forest education for the Mesa Vista School students K-6th grade; multiparty monitoring would be done and data collection that utilizes ecological and socio-economic indicators; outreach would be done and include youth through hands on activities.

There are 19 collaborators identified and 19 letters of endorsement and five seasonal positions will be created.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Olivas- asked on the nonfederal match the proponent was 25% above the match. He missed that.

Mr. Archuleta- it was over by $56…

Mr. Olivas- added strengths- #1-4, 6, 8-10, 22, 29 and 33.

Mr. Cooke- on the Administrative Observation- the budget justification had a purchase under the budget narrative (backhoe.) The proposal states the proponent would purchase a previously owned back hoe; that was a red flag for him.

Mr. Berrens- asked the proponent for clarification on the intent.

Joe Gurule (proponent) - it means he would buy a second hand backhoe; previously owned doesn't mean he owned it.

Mr. Peralta, FS- as the FS administered the proposals they would provide documentation that what the proponent would purchase would be according to today's market value and would not be a lease.

Mr. Bird- added strengths- #13, 14, 16, 17 and 32.

A detail was added to strength #14- *The proponent would actually prepare 43 acres for prescribed burn.* And to strength #32 he added- *The proponent would have two grazing associations as collaborators that committed to the multi-party monitoring team.*

Ms. Burnett- asked to clarify with Shawn Knox with Rocky Mountain Ecology LLC, his employment status with the state in this proposal.

Shawn Knox- currently he is employed with the state but depending on the nature of the funding with the proposals would resign. There would be no conflict in dual roles as a contractor and as an SLO employee. None of the projects he was involved with were on state land.

Mr. Dunn- as a state employee he was prevented from working on a project that was part of his normal job with the FS. The panel was seeking clarification.

Mr. Knox- there is the State Code of Conduct Act that was specific on things an employee could or could not do; one was to accept a job because of influence from outside. There was nothing that stated an employee couldn't leave work and work off of state trust land. His business has been in operation for four years with the new administration as well and they have revised the Code of Conduct and his work was known and disclosed.

Mr. Racher- had called the State Land Office and he was assured there was no problem.

Mr. Barrone- added #18 & 19- also on their budget it stated 5.8 long bed truckloads -he asked if that was 5.88 cords. It was clarified it was 5.88 *loads* for $400 each.

Mr. Racher-regarding the backhoe; the proponent was purchasing a piece of capital equipment and spending enough on the equipment that it could be made to do forestry. He has a concern with that.

Mr. Jervis- the concern was if it was the appropriate piece of equipment; the proposal specifically stated it would be used on the rougher parts of the terrain. It appears that piece of equipment wouldn't be the equipment of choice.

Mr. Dunn- asked what other equipment was more appropriate.

Mr. Gomez- asked the proponent how he would use the equipment to get logs out of a steep terrain.

Mr. Peralta- the concern in the weakness is noted. FS would determine if a more appropriate piece of equipment should be purchased at the time the proponent is funded. If the weakness was down it has to be addressed; the FS is required to negotiate everything in the CFRP.

Mr. Racher- asked if that type of thing should be put into the proposal.

Mr. Dunn- that was a big reason the industry guys were on the panel because of that type of observation; that was their expertise.

Mr. Pohlman- on an Administrative Observation statement about a pole peeler- is that the same one that was included in the budget narrative used in a federal match. He was told it was. He asked how they would resolve that.

Mr. Payne- usually there was other ways to make the match and it could be taken care of.

Mr. Dunn- there have not been many times when the panel recommended a project that was not approved by the Regional Forester, but there have been a couple of times when GNA reviews the nonfederal match and it did not work out and that was something that stops it.

Mr. Payne- if the proponent couldn't demonstrate adequate match then they couldn't get the funds.

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- *There are several separate treatment units within the project area. Page 1 of the proposal has a good explanation of what will be accomplished in each treatment unit.*

Another strength- *Page 8 of the proposal, table 3, indicates a good table that describes existing conditions, desired future conditions and how the results would be measured.*

A weakness was added- #6; no letters to the tribes.

Mr. Matush- he recommended his standard *recommendation to see more descriptions on current existing condition of the forest and surface*. He couldn't tell the success or value of the thinning project or the prescribed burn.

Mr. Payne- a strength was just added that there was a good explanation on page 8, table 3.

Mr. Matush- that wouldn't work; there are so many trees that are 140 years old that are not stand condition. Some proposals actually measured and this was eyeballing. He recommended the strength be removed.

Mr. Gomez- the proponent has the basal area current condition and what the proponent would reduce it to and how they would measure it. The proponent describes dense ladder fuels, canopy covers…

Mr. Matush - dense ladder fuels was relative; he doesn’t see how they got the basal area. The proponent mentioned using common stand exam and they could have started with that.

Facilitator- under recommendations language was added- *The application could be strengthened by including a description of the existing fuel conditions.*

Mr. Gomez- the top of page 8 stated that the focus was reducing areas between 90 and 116 per acre within the project and that it would be based on forest stand summaries used for 2001-it was based on collected data.

Mr. Matush- agreed with Mr. Gomez but would add a recommendation- that *it should be more current data.*

There were other projects he didn't mention that because they contained more information.

FS- verified that FS did use the common stand exam for planning purposes and the forest vegetation is the tool they used to assist them. The information wasn’t current but he pointed out that was why they have monitoring individuals to collect data.

Mr. Matush- unless no one else has problems with 10 year old data; he would just go with prescription fire.

Mr. Payne- a lot of the work done in the past was on 10 year data and it wasn't significantly different; particularly for timber. The FS, many times does not do an entire forest stand exam every 10 years.

Mr. Matush- he agreed the recommendation could be changed for the prescribed burn.

Facilitator- the additional language- *Application could be strengthened by including a description of the existing fuel conditions…*

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #7 and 23. He added weakness #8, 9, 17, 25, 30 and recommendation #33 on program income.

He added recommendations- #5 and 16.

Mr. Bird- asked for clarification on the maps. He thought the maps were unclear…

Mr. Jervis- he might have given the wrong number.

Ms. Burnett- the boundaries were difficult to read because they were in black-and-white.

Facilitator- asked if it wasn't the maps but the *boundaries* that were unclear.

Mr. Jervis- the boundaries on the map are unclear.

Mr. Payne- added that the boundaries and the legend were unclear because of the black and white copy.

Mr. Dunn- added weakness #30- there was no PJ in the proposal. Clarification was asked of the FS.

FS- PJ stands are not identified in the NEPA.

Mr. Jervis- agreed that could be taken out.

Mr. Dunn- a weakness- *The application did not include documentation of consultation with tribes, however copies of letters to tribes was submitted to the panel during the panel meeting and were dated February 2, 2011.*

He added an Administrative Observation- *Assure that Shawn Knox and Rocky Mountain Ecology Consulting would not conflict with the State Land Office Code of Conduct.* He asked that be added to the boilerplate recommendations.

Regarding the income recommendation- on page 8 of the detailed budget narrative- that was another example where more lumber and Kuykendall and Sons would purchase material and that income was reflected in as part of the nonfederal match.

Recommendation #8 was removed.

Mr. Pohlman- asked that the DR letter from the last proposal be used again. Relative to weakness #9- mature trees was on table 3, page 8 and states there were existing conditions for mature trees 111 to 141 years old and old trees over 141 years old that make up a small component of the project area. It states that the desired condition is to establish site conditions that retain existing, mature and old trees … and favor healthy mid age trees.

Mr. Jervis- he wants to leave that in because it wasn't clear they would not cut old trees.

Mr. Pohlman- it states that large and old trees would be maintained during the treatment phase at the end of the paragraph. The proponent was working within the context of the Decision and should be able to do those things within that context, depending on the stands.

Mr. Matush- the proponent should be able to do these things when asking for $350,000 on a proposal; that should be the first thing done so the panel could evaluate the value.

Mr. Dunn- the problem with the statement was it stated the application does not include provisions; but it does. The application addresses that.

Weakness number #9 was removed. A*pplication does not make clear that old and large trees would be preserved.*

Mr. Gomez- read from the bottom of page 7- "the objectives were to increase the density of young and mid age trees, increase ceiling recruitment and establish site conditions that would favor maturation of existing alpha trees."

Mr. Jervis- that sounds like a timber sales prescription where the big trees are taken out and the middle-aged trees could grow up to be timber.

Facilitator- that would be left in.

Mr. Archuleta- the statement on page 8 seemed clear.

Ms. Fisher- agreed and said there should be consistency with the others.

The weakness was removed.

Administrative Discussion

The panel discussed what should be done when letters to the tribes etc. is missing from the application or forgotten and then was provided.

Mr. Dunn- deferred to Ann Watson, the tribal representative.

Ms. Watson- in the future, because it was in the RFA, the proponent should submit the letters with the application by the deadline and no one should be allowed to bring documents, whether NEPA, etc., after the fact and the panel should not accept documents after that.

Mr. Dunn- it was pointed by Ms. San Gil that the bylaws that everyone agreed to in the Open Meetings on the second paragraph, third page: he read from the bylaws- "Members of the public may attend …and at the determination of the chair… offer written comment…Public Comment periods will be scheduled. The panel will consider new information if it is required by the RFP if it constitutes …and the panel will *not* consider new information that was required by 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."

Ms. Fisher- remembered the conversation last year and Ms. Watson said the exact same thing about letters that would not be accepted. It was happening again and she wants to stick to the terms; as of last year, the panel would not accept “I forgot… here it is."

Mr. Dunn- read from the RFA requirement for projects on traditional tribal land- “a letter of support from the affected tribe or pueblo should be attached. If no such letter is available, a copy of the letter from the applicant to the affected tribe, etc. soliciting their comments/concern on the proposed project must be attached with a description of the steps taken to consult with the tribe on the proposed activities."

Mr. Payne- asked if the two letters that were brought in late were eligible.

Mr. Dunn- from what was proposed by Ms. Watson and Ms. Fisher, the panel was saying the letters were ineligible. The letters would be accepted as they do all public comments but the panel would score the proposal as though there were no letters. Technically the proponent could have been eliminated from consideration because the letters were not included. He said the panel missed that.

Mr. Barrone- last year it was put down as a weakness and the panel scored it as that.

Ms. Watson- last year the Nature Conservancy also brought in things after the fact…

Mr. Dunn- the panel would review proposals as if the information was not brought in. The question is whether that was an eligibility criterion that wasn’t there and the proposal becomes ineligible; or it could be a weakness and the proposal would move forward in the ranking.

Ms. Watson- according to the RFA it would be ineligible because the letters were not part of the application.

Ms. Fisher- she wouldn't say it was ineligible but the panel shouldn’t accept the letters at this point and she re-affirmed what Ann said.

Mr. Olivas- the criteria states clearly what could be an effect.

Mr. Barrone- agrees it is a weakness.

Mr. Archuleta- part of the difficulty was the panel switched systems. The previous year the scores were based on a one through four; this year the scores are based on the 13/14 criteria. There is obligation on the FS as to whether the letters were eligible; he wasn't sure that was a panel decision.

Mr. Bird- someone could make a case that the letters should not have been considered, if they didn’t get funded and the person with the late letters does get funded. RFA was black and white language.

Mr. Dunn- the safest thing was to say the letters were ineligible.

Mr. Jervis- it is incumbent on the Forest Service to identify things that were ineligible and insist on the requirements to that meet the requirement of the RFA. This group should not make that decision- Mr. Dunn should make the decision that these are not eligible.

Mr. Dunn- the decision would be made by him and that means they would be pulled.

Mr. Jervis - that means that the last two proposals would be pulled.

Mr. Dunn- agreed the last two would be pulled.

Missing NEPA decision documents were brought up.

Mr. Jervis- this is a very competitive program and if people can't read the instructions they shouldn't be eligible.

Ms. Watson- it comes back to the federal agencies and they are responsible for the consequences. To add to that, the coordinators should make sure when they get the proposals…

Mr. Dunn- a lot of hours was spent trying to do that; there are gray areas. Not having the letters to tribes would be equated to not having a detailed budget so it would be a substantive decision.

Mr. Pohlman-there were orders of magnitude. NEPA Decisions are public and anyone could get them but talking to a tribe about your proposal isn't. The RFA is emphatic about this and this was the only way the items get before the panel. There was a big difference between tribal letters and NEPA Decision that was a matter of public record.

Mr. Archuleta- except that the RFA states that *both* must be there.

Ms. Burnett- the weaknesses that the panel has used are there and had been used in the past to knock out and check for these types of issues that cause the applicant not to be funded. She raised the concern on Monday that the new criteria wouldn't account for that. This should be put in the panels consistency check that those weaknesses that in the past would have caused an applicant not to be funded should be checked for consistency on Thursday or Friday. That was the mechanism that triggered the panel and now if it is a weakness it wasn't being cross referenced directly with the way a proposal was scored.

Mr. Archuleta- when the panel had one through four there was also a fourth of if it was if it was a good project but doesn't fit in the CFRP context. The new scoring system doesn't allow for that conversation.

Mr. Dunn- but the panel could put that as a comment in a recommendation. The decision is made with the idea that there is a scale of severity, i.e. not having tribal letters, a detailed budget or NEPA is one thing; not being 12 point font was something else. If proponents don't have letters to tribes in the application then the proponent was taken out of the scoring system.

Mr. Bird- to be clear on the RFA it stated "where NEPA is already completed the applicant must include a copy of the NEPA Decision Document as an appendix." So it could be a NEPA Decision Memo, Notice or Recommendation.

Mr. Dunn- agreed.

Mr. Archuleta- it came up in utilization and he could see how the NEPA could bar activities on implementation. A NEPA Decision that just mentions materials would be purchased from an area that was cleared… if it was just utilization…that wouldn't impact their project where as implementation would.

Mr. Dunn- was okay with that and the panel agreed.

CFRP 06-11 – Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.

Ms. Burnett left the room for this project due to a conflict of interest.

Project Number:	CFRP 06-11
Organization:	Alamo Navajo School Board, Inc.
Forest:	Cibola, Implementation
Project Title:	Building Economic Opportunity through Workforce Diversification
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000

Tom Jervis provided an overview of this project.

The proposal was implementation of mechanical thinning on the Fisher burn unit. The primary objective is to give existing crew members further experience to treat and to train the crew members in tree marking to enhance their value as forest restoration workers. Approximately 555 acres would be treated in two units of the 8300 acres. The proposal builds on a 2003 grant from BLM and a CFRP grant from 2008 that trained 40 crew members; 20 monitors and 3 heavy equipment operators. This project employs four of those trained crewmembers for three years.

The Decision Notice included is focused on the burn that was completed in 2010. It is noted that up to 20% of the acreage would require mechanical treatment to accelerate recovery of canyon bottoms, historic meadows, aspen stands, ponderosa pines and conifer stands. The proposal is for cutting and removal and some areas of lop and scatter and ponderosa pines and juniper and the district designated a further 330 acres mechanical treatment as follows: 100 acres-small diameter thinning funded by Game and Fish that has been completed; 100 planned for a stewardship contract; 100 acres for timber sales; and 30 acres planned for vigas.

The entire Fisher burn unit was burned in 2010. The question of whether mechanical treatment is necessary has to be asked or if there would be impact on reducing fire danger. The District informed him "the mechanical treatment in the areas that were prescribed burn did not reduce tree density so the mechanical is needed to do that while creating the stand structure required by the Goshawk Guidelines of the forest plan. The area will be prescribed burn again by FS personnel for harvest and routine maintenance."

There were no Administrative Observations.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush- added strength- #1, 31, 29, 18 and #11.

Mr. Racher- added strengths- 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23-24 and 33.

> Mr. Racher added another strength- *This proposal includes training of tribal members and marking of a stand exam that is an increasing need in collaboratively implementing forest service projects which goes to long term management.*

He added recommendation #5.

Facilitator- the recommendation #5 was removed based on information Mr. Jervis asked on the number of cords of wood and dimension lumber.

Mr. Gomez- added strengths- #9 and 28 and weakness #8 - *Poor quality maps with no legend and no vicinity maps.*

Mr. Olivas- added strength #8.

Mr. Bird- added strength- *The Decision Memo for the Fisher unit addresses vehicle travel off routes as well as migratory bird nesting season and avoidance of nest sites.*

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #16, 19, 22 and 32. He added weaknesses- #15, 25 and 28 and recommendations #11, 16, 13 and 14.

Ms. San Gil- #25 was moved to Administration for supplies etc. and noted that has consistently been put under Administrative Observations.

Mr. Jervis- the detail on the market products could be taken out because it was covered by the recommendation of the program income #13.

Mr. Matush- on #14- the proposal had some of the strongest current condition and future condition information.

Mr. Jervis- when he first read the proposal it wasn't clear that it had been burned. The fact that they had already burned made him think, either the Decision to burn was reckless or the Decision to treat mechanically wasn't important. It couldn't have been badly overstocked and too dangerous. It was a contradiction within the proposal.

Mr. Racher- if you're not capable of burning under hot enough conditions you wouldn't meet the NEPA and sometimes when that was done the fire could get away. They put fire into the proposal but had acknowledged they would need to do something to properly implement the ecological role of fire.

Language for #14 was reworded to be specific to the prescription burn… *The proposal could be strengthened if the need for mechanical treatment in a previously burned unit was made more clear.*

Mr. Dunn- asked the FS clarification.

District Ranger- he looked at the area and signed the burn plan and the no go Decision to burn. He doesn't want to burn in that habitat any hotter than that. Monitoring at the burn, they did not accomplish their objectives especially in the canyon bottoms and the meadow types and that was the majority of their treatment.

Facilitator- asked Mr. Jervis if the language was good and he said it was more appropriate to the situation.

Mr. Racher- the recommendation under #11 is premature. Mr. Jervis agreed.

The recommendation #11 was removed.

Mr. Racher- asked for more detail on what Mr. Jervis looked for.

Mr. Dunn- a good description of the previous plan is in the second paragraph of the project history.

Mr. Jervis- this is training grant that would treat acres. The previous grant was a training grant to develop crews. The proponent was increasing the curriculum of training but his question is the proponent has trained 40 crew members and 20 monitors and would only use four of them on the project. He was confused how this project was different than the previous project except in the initial training.

Mr. Racher- this program was one of the initial funding services for establishing this capacity in a much-needed area. Since that was done, the proponent is expanding that capacity to mechanical treatments as well as monitoring. It is slightly different in that the proponent saw an area with need and has stepped up to meet the need.

Mr. Jervis- the previous grant trained 20 monitors and 3 heavy equipment operators.

Mr. Dunn- asked for clarification from the coordinator.

Bill - 20 crew members were trained in hand thinning in anticipation of getting mechanical availability and also three people were trained in ATO. The machine was received in October last year and this was the first project in which they could do mechanical.

Mr. Fox- paragraph 3 on page 4 has a detailed explanation of the evolution of the need where the FS sees a need for contracting services and marking stand exams and mechanical treatments. That was not part of the proponent's previous training but since 2008 budget and workforce reduction, this is a need in training in additional skills they didn't previously recognize.

Weakness #28 was removed.

Mr. Dunn- added strength #26- *The project included cross jurisdictional activities.*

Mr. Jervis- this is all on service land. Clarification was asked of FS.

Bill- the treatments were all on FS land however they were adjacent ongoing treatments on BLM from other contractual vehicles. The landscapes were all connected.

Mr. Dunn- agreed to remove strength #26.

Mr. Racher- said it was part of a larger landscape scale strength #16 (which was determined to already be included in strengths) and it tied to criteria #14.

Ms. Watson- added a recommendation- *The proponent should be commended that they addressed and would train tribal members for year round employment versus short term employment; they would improve communication with problem-solving risk*

groups and that they would work with landowners and other federal agencies to address their management objectives as well.

Strength #29 was added.

It was noted that this was not a revised proposal as previously stated.

Mr. Pohlman- added strength #30- *The proposal included a letter from the forest supervisor acknowledging project goals and pledging resources to ensure its successful completion.*

Mr. Cooke- had an issue with a weakness of the maps. The maps in the appendix were some of the best he has seen in any of the proposals; the USGS map and the stand exam map where they would operate. He asked that weakness be deleted.

Mr. Jervis- had to go to the Decision Notice and read the section number to figure out the first map on the 60,000 and it was the same as the unit on the FS map.

Ms. San Gil- the wrong map was being looked at. This project was out of numerical order.

Facilitator- the weakness would be left.

Mr. Archuleta- in Administration Observations- There is two proposals from the applicant and he wanted to be sure if they were funded for both there wouldn't be trouble for overmatching or over charging for time. He asked that a previous proposal that had information regarding the personnel costs not to exceed one FTE be verified be pulled.

Mr. Racher- a recommendation was up and also corresponded to a strength Mr. Bird put up.

Mr. Jervis- acknowledged the strength but his overall sentiment of the recommendation still stands. The proponent talks about doing bird surveys prior to mechanical work and even experts looking for nests only find around 60% of the nests. He doesn't think the proponent would be using experts and the reality is that doing a survey prior to a mechanical treatment is a Band-Aid; it won’t make a difference.

Break- 5:50 p.m. - 5:55 p.m.

Review of Applications- CFRP 25-11, CFRP 27-11

CFRP 25-11 – Talking Talons Youth Leadership

There were no conflicts of interest noted on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 25-11
Organization:	Talking Talons Youth Leadership
Forest:	Gila, Implementation
Project Title:	Talking Talons Wildlife Habitat Improvement and Landscape Scale Forest Restoration Education Project
Funding Requested:	$360,000

Matching Funds: $90,000
Total Budget: $450,000

Mike Matush provided an overview of this project.

The proponent is an educational group that specializes in birds of prey. The proposal is to restore 430 acres of piñon, juniper, wood land and grass land. The proposal is inside a WUI and in Tijeras and within three communities on the high risks list. There is a large list of collaborators and as of 2010 their education outreach program engaged more than 10,000 people in Bernalillo County alone. The first 20 pages of the documentation was a detailed budget.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Gomez- added strengths #1-4, 6-9, 16 and 17. He added another strength- *Good youth and education component and a lot of collaboration with schools and youth organizations.* Ms. San Gil said she would add the strength to #8.

Mr. Racher- added strengths- #10, 11, 14, 21, 23-24, 27, 28 and 30.
A modification was made to #24 and the word *concise* was removed.

A strength- *The project has extensive outreach in community support prior to the application submittal.*

Mr. Matush- added strength #13 because of the concentration on grasslands restoration.

Mr. Racher- asked for clarification from the FS; was that an area that FS was likely to burn and maintain.

Mr. Fox- it is because if the mechanical was done the way it was proposed it would lend itself to that opportunity; especially if they stick to the intervals. The community would have to be introduced to smoke to get them use to it.

Mr. Matush- added strength- #31.

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #18 and 19- and strength- *The proposal explicitly avoids the nesting season for birds.*

Mr. Jervis added a weakness having to do with PJ restoration #30- *the PJ restoration objectives were not clear.* There is an established body of work that describes various PJ and none of the proposals that addressed PJ said anything about that.

Mr. Racher- it was talked about in the New Mexico Restoration that guides that body of work.

Mr. Bird- was conflicted on that and would take a minute and look at the principles.

Mr. Dunn- asked if the panel looked at page 1 of the executive summary; Statement of Needs.

Mr. Jervis- what was missing was the term of art; is this persistent woodland, a persistent savanna, and encroaching area…

Mr. Bird- another conflict was this is a fire risk protection. He would leave it in; it wouldn't hurt and the PJ was complex. This isn't really a restoration; it is a risk reduction- although it does state "restores piñon and grassland." Mr. Jervis agreed with leaving it in also.

Mr. Dunn- asked if they took into consideration page 9 about desired conditions on the PJ woodland. He asked for clarification from FS.

Mr. Fox- this should historically be a PJ/savanna eco-site and currently a mass amount of PJs has come in and the FS would do both. A huge fire risk was there because of the wall of overgrown PJ and at the same time they would reduce the fire risk and restore it back to PJ/savanna.

Mr. Bird- thought that was fine. There was a good paper on woodland typing.

The weakness was left in.

Ms. Burnett- added a strength- *The letter from Forest Fitness LLC supports the budget request.*

A weakness- *The letter from Arid Land Innovation does not support the budget request and the proposal. There were no costs in the contractor's letter.*

Mr. Cooke- added strength- *Great Maps*.

Mr. Bird- added to the strength about the nesting season for birds… *as well as it avoids cross country motorized travel and no new or temporary roads would be constructed.*

Mr. Berrens- added a strength- he liked that the project has the potential to involve urban youth in learning about forest restoration - *The proposal includes scouts in fuel wood removal, education and outreach components and raises possibility of Eagle Scout Leadership and troop service projects on wildfire risk reduction and monitoring topics.*

Mr. Archuleta- added recommendation #1 with modification- *The application could have been strengthened by collaboration with the village of Tijeras and the Canon de Carnue Land grant and any applicable acequias in the project design, implementation and monitoring.*

Mr. Dunn- in regard to weakness #30- they would have to add language about the PJ not being adequately addressed because there were multiple references in the application.

Mr. Cooke- added a strength- *The Forest Fitness LLC treatment costs are very competitive.*

Mr. Jervis- added a strength- *The project will serve as an excellent example of restoration treatments that will be highly visible to the public and therefore advance long term management of forest lands.* More demonstration type projects were needed. He asked Ms. San Gil to add an example of a restoration treatment.

Mr. Gomez- added a recommendation- *Based on the title of the proposed project, which mentions wildlife habitat improvement the proponent could include in the monitoring plan the collection of data on wildlife numbers and sightings, etc.*

Mr. Pohlman- asked to visit strength #18- regarding providing materials for local utilization industries; he asked if the proponent provided anything to a utilization industry.

The panel agreed strength #18 would be removed.

Mr. Pohlman- added strength- *The proposal includes a letter of support from a District Ranger recognizing project benefits and committing staff and committing to treating the remaining 288 acres analyzed in the NEPA but not included in this proposal.*

Mr. Dunn- on weakness #30- Appendix F, page 115 under existing condition #3 has a description of the existing condition and at the top of page 117 has an extensive description of the existing condition and objectives.

Weakness #30 was removed.

Public Comment Period

A letter of comment was read into record by Scott Lerich who said he wanted to address the letter that was left out of his proposal:

"The letter was addressed on February 25, 2011 at 8:40 and dated February 24, 2011 to Mr. Roger Tucker, 16 Sunset Rd., Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507.

I am writing this letter of commitment for the Roger Tucker, Inc. (Tucker) proposal to the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program entitled "Improved Utilization of Small Diameter Trees in Central New Mexico."
The National Wild Turkey Federation (NWTF) is committed to being a member of the Multiparty Monitoring Team. This commitment will consist of the following: 1) participating in quarterly multiparty meetings, 2) at those meetings provide information and outreach on ongoing and upcoming projects, 3) become aware of increasing needs and capacity of your manufacturing facility and its need for material, 4) engage in communication with all multiparty monitoring team members to further fuels reduction in restoration projects in Central New Mexico and 5) provide you with any and all socio-economic monitoring data needed from projects that we partner on.

In New Mexico the NWTF is currently involved in the Blue Water Stewardship project which includes product removal opportunities. In addition to active projects we also have the following future project: Jim Lewis project on the Lincoln NF.

A constant problem in successfully accomplishing our fuels reduction and restoration projects has been due to the lack of wood manufacturing businesses. This proposal requesting additional processing equipment would be essential in creating a much-needed market. We ask that CFRP panel strongly consider this proposal for funding as it will increase acres

treated, create jobs and utilize small diameter material that currently is being wasted and left on-site.

Sincerely,
Scott P. Lerich,
Senior Regional Biologist
National Wild Turkey Federation
P.O. Box 1281
La Luz, New Mexico 88337
575-434-2936
slerich@nwtf.net

Facilitator- David Cordova (Aspen Forest Products) asked before he left that she read his public comment into the record. This is a response to Proposal 16 Panel Weaknesses.

The letter was read as follows:

I wanted to address the panel's recommended weaknesses on the Aspen Forest Products proposal.

Weakness 9:-Application does not include a provision for preserving old and large trees.

Response- Aspen Forest Products disagrees with the weakness. Aspen Forest Products states that on page 1, the executive summary states that all old growth timber will be preserved. Page 5, objective 4 of the proposal states Silvicultural prescriptions recommend that healthy, disease-free trees in all diameter classes in large and old growth will be retained. Page 6 on the Prescriptive work plan states that this will ensure that old and large trees; the old growth is protected and preserved. As far as discussion of a white fir objectives that created the panel confusion, could have been clarified by asking Forest Products. The proposal mentions that since white fir can grow to large sizes quickly it may also be appropriate to remove some large diameter white fir. Aspen Forest Products will not remove any old growth timber at all and never stated it would be in the entire proposal. The weakness states that there will be removal of old growth. Aspen Forest Products repeatedly states throughout the body its overall objective of not removing any old growth. Aspen Forest Products feels strongly that this should not have been listed as a weakness.

Furthermore Aspen Forest Products never related large diameter trees to any specific dimension to or old growth. The call for the removal of large white fir came directly from the NEPA prescription.

Weakness #15- with no estimates of market values of products or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business application.

Response- on other proposals the same issue has come up. On other proposals this has not been listed as a weakness but has been listed as a recommendation. There is

no consistency with other proposals on this and they should not be listed as a weakness on Proposal 16.

Weakness #28-the RFP states that the project history needs to address other federal or private grants for related activities and what the status of those projects and/or grants.

Response- Aspen Forest Products did not include an update on the Borrego Mesa project because it considered the two products were not related and were separate projects on two completely different forests and managed by two separate Ranger Districts.

Aspen Forest Products believed it answered the questions presented in the RFP. The Borrego Mesa CFRP is progressing and moving forward with its plan goals and objectives and is an ongoing project.

Facilitator- the other two letters of public comment would be read the following day since the applicants were not present.

Mr. Dunn- noted that the letters would be addressed in the Consistency Review.

A note was made to panel members to address the two letters that were read into the record on Thursday and Friday in the Consistency Review.

CFRP 27-11 – Jose Barrios Elementary School

No conflict of interest was noted for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 27-11
Organization:	Jose Barrios Elementary School
Forest:	Gila, Implementation
Project Title:	Implementation of Silva Creek Restoration: An Urban Interface or Riparian and Watershed Restoration as an Ongoing Public Educational Resource
Funding Requested:	$359,991
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$449,991

Tim Pohlman provided the overview for this project.

This project would be managed by the staff of Jose Barrios Elementary School that will manage a collaborative partnership to restore 2.5 acres of riparian habitat while providing outdoor educational opportunities to hundreds of students in the Grant County area. The project objective includes erosion control, reduction of hazardous fuels, reduction of invasive species, development of an outdoor classroom and modeling of urban forestry. The project is in an urban forest typified by the presence of non-native invasive species, dense tree canopy, and ladder fuels that increase the threat of intense wildfire. Additionally the area erodes during flood events. The project site is adjacent to the school as well as two other mutual properties; the Silva Creek Botanical Gardens and the historical municipal waterworks building, a site that ranks among the most endangered historic landmarks in New Mexico.

The project collaborators include the Silver City Consolidated School District, the USFS, the town of Silver City, the Wellness Coalition Youth Conservation Corps, The New Mexico Environment Department Service Water Quality Bureau, Lone Mountain Natives, Snedaker Enterprises and Tom Laws CPA.

The proponent and partners will accomplish program goals in the following fashion: the Wellness Coalition will perform fuels reduction; plant native vegetation and perform erosion control. Treatments for contributions of material and staffing from the Town of Silver City, the New Mexico Environmental Department will help develop the erosion control plan; Lone Mountain and Snedaker will provide landscape services and Tom Laws, CPA would monitor the budget and track expenditures.

The Gila National Forest Supervisor provided a letter supporting goals and objectives of the program and committing some assistance for program educational goals; referencing the proposals consistency with the agency's More Kids in the Woods Program. Jose Barrios teachers and project partners would collaborate to develop a curriculum for 250 K-5 students each year. Students would monitor under tutelage, vegetation, wildlife including macro invertebrates, erosion and other physical and biological conditions in the project area. Ecological and social monitoring elements were included in the plan including the effects that participating in project monitoring will have on math and science scores of student participants.

Mr. Pohlman noted a discrepancy on the 424 and the actual request amount. He confirmed with the Gila's coordinator and the request is for $359,991.

Ms. San Gil- the discrepancy was picked up and included in the Administrative Observations.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Racher- added strengths- #2 and 4. He added weaknesses- #10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 31. He added detail to: #12-*more information was needed on the site specific existing condition and proposed activities, specifically non-natives especially Siberian elm.* He saw no activities that would control that and it would need to be removed, roots and all, or herbicides used. This also applies to #18- and *treatment plans are vague and methods to control non native are not given.*

He asked Mr. Matush if the time for the NMEP was good.

Mr. Matush- he couldn't answer that.

Mr. Racher- asked to add that it be verified that New Mexico Environment Department match is nonfederal funds.

Mr. Partido, FS- it isn't federal money.

Mr. Racher- added a weakness- *The total acreage to be treated is unclear*. He asked for clarification from the FS.

Mr. Partido- 2.5 acres were Jose Barrios Elementary School and another 2.5 acres was in the town of Silver City and the total is five acres.

The weakness was removed.

Mr. Gomez- asked clarification from the FS on section 106 consultation- How much does that hold as far as NEPA.

Mr. Partido- that was researched and they worked with the city as well. That was a Brown site study and the wash is downstream from a mine that excluded any further NEPA. As long as NEPA was done it would be improving the watershed and it is mentioned in the last appendix portion.

Weakness #31 was removed.

Mr. Matush- added strengths- #1, #8 and 22. *Proposed educational activities would be added.*

Mr. Racher- asked Mr. Matush to verify number 22 on educational activities; he was disappointed in the treatment difference.

Mr. Matush- added additional strength- *Educational activities will tie to the New Mexico Educational math and science standards.*

Mr. Jervis- added strengths- #3, 10, 11, 15, 19-21, 23, 24, 26 and 29 and the recommendation on seasonal #16.

A weakness- #8 was added but he said it could be because of the scale of the map. Mr. Jervis then decided he would drop weakness #8.

A strength- *The project is not traditional CFRP riparian activity yet is worthy given the high visibility and public involvement.*

Mr. Dunn- regarding the weakness #10- no discussion of the ecological role of fire; fire wouldn't be done within the village limits and that weakness might not be appropriate.

Mr. Archuleta- agreed and also on the size of the acreage (five acres) - it was brought up the previous day by Mr. Racher about the historical disturbance regime was *flood* not fire.

Mr. Racher- it was more a discussion not about the ecological role of fire but what the ecosystem should be and the disturbance regime. That was part of the learning that would come from this.

Mr. Dunn- it could be a recommendation as part of the educational program.

The panel discussed the site and the learning that would come from that.

Mr. Racher- doesn't expect them to burn nor would they flood the area.

Mr. Archuleta- it was a good recommendation for it to be part of the learning curriculum.

Facilitator- asked for language for the recommendation.

The language was: *The project should recognize as part of the educational curriculum, natural eco system processes, specifically disturbance processes that help form these riparian communities,*

The item was removed from weakness and put into a recommendation.

Mr. Dunn-regarding weakness #14- there was no herbicide use because of the school and the city. Clarification was asked of the FS.

Mr. Partido- checked how the project would be done. The school doesn’t recommend the use of herbicides because it was in a riparian area and secondly, because it is in a school and an outdoor classroom, the school felt it should be done without chemicals and should be incorporated into the learning.

Facilitator- should that stay in as a weakness or is there a change of language.

Mr. Racher- if there no herbicides were being used he was okay with the weakness being removed.

Mr. Dunn-on weakness #18 on utilization plans- a statement is at the top of page 4 that materials removed would be used as wood chips for trails, corrosion control, and surplus would be donated to low income community members.

Mr. Racher- the utilization part could be taken out; he was specifically targeting treatment.

Mr. Dunn- added a recommendation- *The proponents may want to consider funding through the Forest Service urban forestry programs, which may be a better match for their objectives than CFRP*.

Ms. Burnett- added weakness- #2 and 13 and #2 with detail- *conservation groups*- there was a letter from The Nature Conservancy but it was just a general letter support. There were no conservation groups in the design and implementation.

Mr. Racher- the outreach and education component is a tremendous benefit.

Ms. Burnett- understood what he was saying but this is 5 acres of riparian administration.

Mr. Racher- the acreage doesn't matter.

Ms. Burnett- this is a great project to get kids in the woods however that could be done by having a partner on other CFRP projects.

Mr. Jervis- would argue against the weakness. The point was not to build capacity but this would actually build public support. Mr. Matush agreed.

Ms. Burnett- kids were doing monitoring; the project is a good one but it doesn't add to capacity for restoration.

Mr. Dunn- usually the comment is related to training people. This doesn't imply that it wasn't doing a great job in terms of environmental education or other elements. It was just the physical capacity to do restoration.

He added More Kids in the Woods to his recommendation.

Mr. Archuleta- a recommendation was that - The proponent might want to contact Los Padilla's Elementary School in Albuquerque that has similar outside learning. Also, Las Vegas School District also has similar program in partnership with New Mexico State; the Sweeny School in Santa Fe and the Bosque School in Albuquerque and Los Niño's in Las Vegas.

Mr. Berrens- on the strength regarding the Math standards #22- He is an educator that spends a lot of his time dealing with math standards and is concerned because a of the categorical testing that could go up and down for various reasons. There is a monitoring issue with the proposal.

He doesn't view this as a strength although it has potential for useful information that could be inferred out. This could and is likely, to generate false inferences. He would question if it should be a strength though he is willing to leave it but there is no measurement.

He made a recommendation- *The math and science standard based testing has to establish control groups for valid inference*. That will be difficult to do but he wasn't sure he was advocating taking this out of the strength; he just wanted to raise an issue in his recommendation.

Mr. Partido- this was discussed and it wasn't clearly stated in the proposal. The proponent plans to have a control group before this group to monitor test scores of other schools in the district. Other control groups were being looked at to base their standards off of.

Mr. Berrens- he was okay with that and wouldn't want the opportunity to be lost.

Mr. Cooke- asked Mr. Partido if there was discussion on the safety issue of having snags left inside a learning area.

Mr. Partido- yes, there was some discussion and that would be monitored. The other part of safety discussed was that YCC folks are trained to recognize that and the hazards and they would do maintenance. If trees become a hazard they would be removed. There are snags now and that was the reason they came to FS.

Mr. Cooke- was okay with that if it has been considered.

Mr. Matush- added a strength- *The town of Silver City made a nice matching contribution in the form of equipment, labor, materials and water*.

Mr. Pohlman- added a strength- *The proposal includes a letter of support from the Forest Supervisor that supports the goals and objectives and pledges assistance with the educational efforts.*

Review of the Day's Work and Agenda

Facilitator- the following morning the panel will start with the Public Comment and there will be eight proposals. The panel will focus on consistency at the end of the day.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

April 28, 2011

Review Agenda for the Day

The Facilitator asked those were present to sign in on a sign in sheet at the back of the room. She announced that public comments left from last night would be read later in the day when they had public comment. She explained those comments left from yesterday were on projects the panel had already reviewed; not for reviews scheduled for today. All public comments would be read around 11:30 or 11:45.

She said they would spend the majority of the morning in reviewing proposals and then spend the rest of the day reviewing the work for consistency.

Review Applications

2011 CFRP Grant Proposals: CFRP 28-11 Rev. 1, 29-11 Rev 2, 30-11 Rev 2 and 31-11 Rev. 1
Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

CFRP 28-11 – The Wellness Coaltion

There were no conflicts of Interest on this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 28-11
Organization:	The Wellness Coalition
Organization Type:	Non-Profit
Forest:	Gila
Project Title:	Conservation Corps Forest Restoration Project
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000
Evaluation Category:	Implementation

Mr. Brent Racher presented the overview of this project.

The project summary 28-11, from the Wellness Coalition, entitled "Conservation Corps Forest Restoration Project - an implementation project to perform approximately 200 acres for treatment in the area near the Silver City Ranger Station. The 200 acres are located along a road and intended as a buffer for bird blocks.

A little bit of history here first - this is one of the first in the area looking for grants. This is definitely a landscape scale or a part of a landscape scale treatment. And in this we have a youth corps of 25-35 that will be trained in the terms of this as well as the type 2 firefighters to assist the Forest Service and other fire fighting agencies.

The utilization on this is good. They will process into small firewood to distribute to low income families and also utilize some of it in their conservation wood workshop.

The agency also deals with education and public awareness with elementary and middle schools there in Grant County.

Partners include the Forest Service, Cobre Consolidated School District, Central School, the Conservation District, Western New Mexico University, Small Business Development Center, Nature Conservancy, Strain Fire Wood and Rocky Mountain Fire.

They are looking for $360,000 and total project budget of $450,000.

The Facilitator opened it to the panel.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Danny Gomez had strengths 1-4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14.

The Facilitator asked to look at the Administrative Observations:

Mr. Bryan Bird added strength #29 due to ranked them high. He thought it was a particular strength to train youth to get firefighting certificates and those youth could go on to careers in fire management.

Mr. Dan Barrone asked what category this project was in.

The Facilitator said it was Demonstration.

Mr. Barrone added strengths - S 15, 17, 19

Mr. Racher added strength #25 they addressed adequately or did a good job of actually dealing with prior weaknesses and recommendations.

He also had a question for clarification for anyone who could answer it. In training the corps members for becoming fire fighters, is the Forest Service willing to carry the red cards for them?

Ranger McDougall, Coordinator for the Gila said yes. They currently have an AD program on the forest that they just resurrected. And when they were approached with this grant, they were in the process of doing that. The benefit for the forest is that the YCC crews are on for a longer period of time. Right now they have a shortage of firefighters due to the majority of the Ads being students. So we would incorporate to hold special classes for the YCC because we are doing this anyway for the community and what we call southwestern fire fighter Program (SWIFT). So we would just incorporate that and we do have their personal protection and equipment - all their gear already purchased and ready to go. So we would be supplying that for them.

Mr. Racher said he would like to state that *the Wellness Coalition has strong collaboration with the Forest Service, Fire Program in training and qualifying (carrying a red card) for the program.* That is actually an important step. We can thank people all we want to but nobody within NWCT that ever carries their red card.

Mr. Jervis on that same point asked, “Will there be an opportunity for these guys in terms of graduating to Class 1 as openings develop among the hot shot fire crews?”

Mr. McDougall said that’s ... and not just the Type One crews - the hot shot crews, but that’s how we hire the majority of our entry level fire fighters. They gain experience on fires and we also as the Forest

Service, evaluate their performance. Currently we have three engine captains, 4 hand crew foremen and 7-8 fighters in the program and that's how they started. So that's how we get our folks.

Mr. Pohlman added as a strength that *The District Ranger's support letter verifies the agency's role in the project and expresses confidence that the proponent is capable of performing the work.* (Number 5)

Mr. Cooke added strength #3. He was impressed that they put their sampling design in here. They've got a good description of measuring techniques and sampling design.

Mr. Matush asked for clarification. The applicant (I'm looking on page - I don't know what page it is. On the page summary, you've got me word for word.) The question I have is you have Matt Schultz of Rocky Mountain Ecology, LLC. Is that correct or maybe just a mistake. Matt Schultz is from the Environment Department. You have him down in several references as Rocky Mountain, LLC.

Dave Chandler from the Wellness Program said yes. That is just a mistake. We were writing two proposals and I think perhaps it got in there by mistake.

Mr. Matush said that was fine.

Ms. Burnett asked on that point if John Knox was correct.

Mr. Chandler confirmed that John Knox was the right person at Rocky Mountain LLC and Matt Schultz was not. It was a mistake.

Ms. Burnett pointed out that the contract letter did not conform to budgeted costs for monitoring services. And on page 5, in this collaborator commitment table, there are two collaborators that did not provide match in their letters.

Mr. Dunn asked if she could be specific.

Ms. Burnett agreed. *Silver Consolidated District Schools, Cobre Consolidated School District and Rocky Mountain Ecology, LLC are listed as having an in-kind match. And their letters don't confirm that but it is also not in the budget so it may be that the table needs to be updated.*

The Facilitator pointed to the screen and asked if she could fill in where it had a question mark.

Ms. Burnett said the other school district is Cobre Consolidated School District and Rocky Mountain Ecology LLC.

Mr. Dunn said it should also say "and the budget."

Ms. Burnett agreed. The table is on page 4.

Mr. Dunn went back to Strength #29 and offered some language to the beginning of that sentence. *The proposal is an excellent example of the intent of Criterion 9.* And then delete the other language. He editorialized to say this is the kind of thing that was intended by that language in Criterion 9. We all understand the environment and we love it but this is what the criterion 9 was about. He often tried to explain to people that he liked kids but all the stuff like the school project was not what we were thinking when we drafted this. This is.

Mr. Vincent added strength #17. They include a wood shop in it - a youth wood shop that should add potentially added value and also training.

Mr. Dunn recalled the wood shop in Taos wasn't doing so well. He asked Mr. Chandler if he had a chance to talk with them about that.

Mr. Chandler said he did.

Mr. Dunn suggested they avoid whatever the problem had been up there.

Mr. Chandler said they had talked with them. He thought they didn't want to overestimate the profitability of the wood shop but they saw it as a place to gain and enhance their skills - to use some of the biomass they were pulling out of the forest. But for the most part it is a place to build some nice things and hopefully sell some stuff but it is not an integral piece to the program where we actually would have to make a profit. We've got most of the tools already purchased. We want to see it utilized more. It is also a great place when the weather is bad or someone is injured and can't work outside that day or a doctor's appointment or a court hearing that day and can't go out and work. They can go to the wood shop and get some work done.

Mr. Dunn said it was added value then.

Mr. Chandler agreed.

Mr. McDougall said it was focusing more on using the right equipment.

Mr. Vincent had one more strength to add - strength #10. They are doing this along road sides.

Mr. Gomez wanted to add to boilerplate strength #29. He added that *in the proposal the proponent explains in detail how in licensing crew members, training and skills will be developed in relationship to the CFRP project.*

Mr. Gomez had two more (separate ones). *They had a very good letter to the tribes explaining the CFRP proposed project and the last one is a very good detailed map.*

Ms. Burnett said a strength that supports Mr. Dunn's question - strength #8 that the Wellness Coalition would develop their monitoring capabilities. So the strength she offered was t*his proposal demonstrates the importance of collaborating with similar organizations and sharing lessons learned with others.* She found it commendable that they are reaching out to other organizations to help them pick up.

She had a question about their sharing. She had a hard time finding where they state that they would preserve old and large trees.

Mr. Jervis asked for a point of clarification - if there were any old trees in that area.

Mr. Chandler replied that they mentioned that the 200 acres where the work is going to occur is in a Mexican Spotted Owl preservation protected activity center. So what they were going to be doing was thinning the trees from below because they were going to use the road as the control line and

we have diameter limits. Anything above 9 inches cannot be harvested or cut. So it is specifically both 9" and below will be removed for the fuel break.

Mr. Jervis asked then if there was no question about this.

Mr. Chandler said there was no question about this because it is in a Mexican Spotted Owl protected activity center.

Mr. Barrone said on page 6 under utilization it explained that.

Mr. Jervis saw it and it says there what they will cut.

Ms. Burnett said that was not a strength but just a statement. She didn't want it as a strength.

Mr. Pohlman asked if the actual diameter as a percentage of each diameter that will be cut there is broken out. It doesn't use that as a statement. It doesn't break it out.

The Facilitator asked Ms. Burnett if she still wanted it out as being not as specific as she would like.

Mr. Olivas asked to leave it in.

Mr. Vincent wanted it left in too.

The Facilitator said it should stay in.

Mr. Racher said it is a relative term. And we don't necessarily have that information except from Mr. Chandler.

The statement was left in.

Mr. Jervis noted that the question was addressed to Dave. Mr. Jervis didn't think it was a weakness.

Mr. Dunn referred to page 5 of the proposal to the paragraph under the objective heading, the last sentence said, "We will not cut or damage any large diameter trees."

Mr. Jervis wanted to add strengths #11, (15 - we have that one already), 19-21, 23, 24, 26 and 30. Did we delete 26? Okay delete 26 and 19.

Mr. Pohlman added weaknesses 24 and 25. He asked if Administrative staff captured that.

Ms. San Gil said they had a question on it.

Mr. Pohlman said he would like to add 24 and 25 under Administrative Observations not as weaknesses.

Mr. Jervis had a question about Knox.

Mr. Payne suggested weakness # 6 - *to assure that hiring Shawn Knox as a consultant doesn't conflict with the Code of Conduct.*

Mr. Jervis added Recommendation #16 also.

Mr. Pohlman added Strength #33.

Mr. Matush asked Mr. Chandler to clarify a statement from page 7 with the Small Business Development Center for 20 hours at $100 per hour. He wasn't worried about the math there but wanted to know, "What is Western doing for you?"

Mr. Chandler said they are doing a business plan for the wood shop. We want to take it seriously and the consulting services from the University will help. The agency and the young people would benefit from their consulting.

Mr. Matush wanted to make that a new strength as *it was commendable that the Wellness Coalition got Western NMSU involved in a business plan.* He commented that it was not easy for anyone to get Western to do anything for them.

Mr. Dunn said that would be an edit to strength #25. The applicant has done a very thorough job of it.

Mr. Cooke commented that on Strength #20, they are going to leave a lot of small trees in the woods so he was not sure that would apply. Maybe it would be for chipping or mulching.

Mr. Bird asked if "by product" means anything is cut. He had some concerns.

Mr. Pohlman guessed that it would come back.

The Facilitator asked Mr. Cooke if he could live with it by taking out 100% (of the small trees). Mr. Cooke agreed.

The Facilitator reviewed the strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. She asked for the score sheets.

CFRP 29-11 – Restoration Technologies

Mr. Mike Matush had a conflict of interest and left the room for this proposal

Project Number:	CFRP 29-11
Organization:	Restoration Technologies
Organization Type:	Business
Forest:	Gila
Project Title:	Landscape Restoration and Watershed Rehabilitation Using Woody Biomass from Forest Restoration thinning
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching Funds:	$90,000
Total Budget:	$450,000
Evaluation Category:	Implementation

Mr. Larry Vincent presented this proposal.

It is a 4 year demonstration for restoration using wood mulch. It would complete 7 erosion sites on approximately 3 acres. Participants included the New Mexico Environmental Department, Gila WoodNet, Gila National Forest, Solutions, Town of Silver City, Gila Conservation Education Center, students from Aldo Leopold High School and New Mexico State Forestry and Santa Clara Woodworks. It is a different approach for using small diameter trees and uses a new technique (using woody biomass byproducts). Goals were stated. It did comprehensively address the six purposes of the CFRP.

Panel Discussion

Ms. Burnett added under Recommendations that this proposal is really a utilization proposal and it should be compared with other utilization projects.

The Facilitator said that would be put under Administrative Observations.

Mr. Berrens added Strengths #12, 22, 25 and 29.

Mr. Jervis added Strengths #1-4, 6 (although that is not entirely relevant - take 6 out), 13, 16 and 18.

Mr. Gomez added Strength #7 and agreed with Strengths #25 and 29.

Mr. Olivas, for clarification, on the Administrative weakness regarding one dollar amount, He caught the same thing in the budget where Gordon West was coordinator. It was not the $20 he was talking about but the $80.

Mr. West said if you read it there, $60 is his time. The additional $20 is for his time in the shop.
Mr. Olivas said he read that as $140 per hour. Sixty goes to the Coordinator; $80 goes to the modification.

Mr. West thought it was accurate just the way it was stated; when he was working in the shop that included additional equipment. That type of job has more equipment.

Mr. Payne asked if we are just saying the $20 difference should not be under personnel. $60 is his time and the added $20 is shop time.

Mr. Racher understood that under personnel he gets $60 per hour but when he is working in the shop the work is charged at $80 per hour. It is the same person doing different things for different rates.

Mr. Gordon West agreed that Mr. Racher was accurate. The $80 shop time isn't included in the other category. It is like another position.

Mr. Payne asked to get it straight. "When you are not in the shop you are not paying yourself $60 per hour and $80 per hour at the same time.

Mr. West said no - that it was just increasing the rate by $20 to cover the electricity, etc.

Mr. Olivas noted this is a four-year budget and asked if that was okay.

Mr. Dunn agreed. The limits are 4 years, $360,000 in federal funds, $450,000 total and not more than $120,000 in federal funds in any particular year and not more than $150,000 in any particular year.

Mr. Bird had a new Strength - speaking to quasi criteria 14. He thought it better to say-*The letter from Freeport, McMoRan, Cooper and Gold demonstrates a significant or a potential significant market for this product and long term capacity for restoration of forest.* From what I understand, it is not easy to get these giant multi-national corporations to recognize these local projects. I was very impressed.

Mr. Racher added Strength #6 for this project because he remembered this was something we had a few years ago - trouble with them because NEPA was incomplete before.

He had a Recommendation with his language and wanted to discuss it. *In terms of benefits for risk, the risk of this project is difficult to quantify. The proponents should help clarify the risk of getting nothing vs. bearing fruit in a cost/benefit analysis of the local project specifically to the CFRP program.*

Mr. Dunn didn't understand that.

Mr. Racher explained that in seeing this project a number of times; looking at the budget and looking at the project that we are not guaranteed that we are going to come out with a process or approval for use of this and that it may ramp up to whatever utilization that is out there. With that said, I'm okay with taking some risk for projects like this.

Mr. Dunn asked what he meant - that CFRP is taking a risk with it? Who is taking a risk?

Mr. Racher replied - we are putting dollars into a business that is not a proven entity at all. With that said, I would be okay with taking some of that risk but one of the things that comes out is that the proponents plan, the local businesses are also paying them a lot of money. So they are putting all that risk on this program and probably something is put on them to put some of their own money into this. But the majority of that risk is from the federal investment in this program. It is kind of

a “how much skin do you have in the game.” Small local businesses are driven to make things successful if they have significant amount of skin in the game and I don’t know whether this project has it involved here.

Mr. Berrens thought his point was valid but what we want from public perspective is some cost/benefit analysis performed on this. He saw as a strength that he was going to offer specific language: *A strength is in the letter of commitment from the Economist Keith Stockman at Rocky Mountain Research Station to help with evaluating cost effectiveness of the proposed treatments in the burned area emergency response*. He didn’t disagree with the comments about incentivizing and risk taking in the activities.

Mr. Racher agreed with that. But programmatically we are taking much more of the risk.

Mr. Dunn thought that one purpose of federal grants is to explore new ideas and provide a funding source for people to explore new ideas when funding for doing so would not be available in the normal financial sector. That’s why a lot of federal grant programs exist. He thought CFRP has done a lot. What you need to do while funding projects like that is what Bob described - just make sure you have a good process in place to measure. Did it work? Didn’t it work? If it didn’t work, why? That’s valuable information.

So to me, these kinds of projects where the risk is when they don’t work out as anticipated and then there is not a good recording system in place to describe why. That is where you would get in trouble with an audit. You wouldn’t get in trouble on our end if you did what you said you were going to do. But it didn’t turn out the way you thought it would, it is like research. It is a trial and error thing. But where we get in trouble is when that happens and there is not a clear written record and process for describing what happened and if it didn’t work, why it didn’t work. That’s where the risk is. So when you have Bob’s thing in there, there seems to be a process for measuring that. I don’t think there is that much risk to the program. The purpose of the program is to explore innovative ideas and to document which ones work and which ones don’t.

Mr. Racher referred to the value of the project - “Are we getting a bigger bang for the buck somewhere else?”

Mr. Dunn felt that was a different question. That was not a risk. .

Mr. Racher didn’t think it was wrong.

Mr. Dunn - “Is that a recommendation? Let me look at that.”

Mr. Olivas added to that conversation that the documentation on page 2, last paragraph concerning Zerosian’s activity that had taken place already. They did a feasibility study in 2006 so in his opinion they have done the initial steps to get it where it is today. What he would suggest some strength language to contradict that recommendation? From the language on page 2, last paragraph. - *The strength is: project peels off of funding sources from previous private funding.*

Mr. Bird noted that the USDA grant was public funding.

Mr. Jervis suggested if we put it in as a recommendation we have to put it in certainly for all the utilization projects and many of the implementation projects simply because not all of them work

out. Mr. Dunn has revealed details of projects he visited where the results were not as expected by a long shot. So we would be asking them to do something we are not asking of lots of others.

Mr. Dunn referred to the intent and purposes of federal grants. On page 4 of the proposal, third paragraph down it says, "Current work within the scope of the USDA CSREES SBIR Phase II grant includes optimizing the mixing and application strategies for Erosion at the laboratory scale." This is a trial effort.

Also on page 10 on the economic monitoring, Gordon quotes Penny Luehring who works for the US Forest Service BAER & Watershed Improvement Program, "The take home message is that when it comes to erosion control we are always looking for better techniques and better products that can also result in cost savings – well designed and impartial product evaluations help us to choose the best tool for any particular situation."

So this all gets back to this thing. He didn't see any risk. That is what grants are designed to do. So he didn't see any risk to the program as long as the effort is well documented. We should get rid of that first sentence and don't know about the second one.

Mr. Payne took it out. Mr. Vincent and Mr. Jervis agreed with taking it out.

Mr. Dunn felt it was just exploring a new technology. It was like doing scientific research.

Mr. Bird, on the same point, pointed out that- we take a lot of risks on projects but you are talking about where the ethical obligation is about what a business would put up in a business risk. It is spreading the fiscal risk across the board so it is not so much.

Mr. Dunn disagreed. That is a different thing. He asked if Mr. Bird wanted to put up some new language.

Mr. Bird didn't want to put language up there.

Mr. Berrens though they were talking about scale here. We are subsidizing a component of the risk so we have to ask the public what we will get for subsidizing a component of the business here. We get social learning. He has done all the necessary steps; he has gone to exactly the right people. We've got the Rocky Mountain Research Station, we've got Keith Stockman (I looked him up and did the background on it. He has done it.) It is everything he needs to do in the economic model and the public gets social learning. That's our benefit side - subsidizing a component of the risk.

He might get some future gains out of this but so will we as well. And USDA is asking for the development of these types of products.

We did this a lot. We used to spend lots of money in the program on small business development centers and business advice, etc for not-for profits and they are just at a lower scale - a lot of times to help people on businesses of firewood. This is just at a different scale and I think the potential social gain in this is certainly good. There are risks involved in the potential social gain. I really endorse this. We put them through the wringer and they came back and they've responded to the issues we had. They added a strong component of monitoring here on the things we felt were important.

Ms. Burnett went back to her recommendation. Considering that funds will be awarded based on the

categories, she thought this is a strong utilization category project. She would like feedback. It is a great project but might not be categorized correctly.

Mr. Bird pointed out that we don't have to fund any utilization projects. It says up to...

Mr. Dunn clarified that the panel doesn't fund anything but makes a recommendation. The question is if you are ranking proposals in the implementation category, how do you deal with one that might run a better race with the utilization proposals than with the other implementation proposals; especially if you are comparing this project with other ones in that category.

Mr. Jervis said the interest on the part of the Forest Service in this project is to his mind substantially significant. In their projects they pour enormous amounts into grants for rehabilitation measures that many of which have already been demonstrated to be ineffective. They spent $13 million in the Cerro Grande fire - or maybe it wasn't that much. And a number of processes that the Forest Service used over and over again in their projects have been shown to be ineffective. So the fact that this could be effective is an enormous step forward for the overall BAER process. That is sort of speaking to the potential. That is one point - so he thought the benefit potential is much larger.

And the other point he wanted to make with respect to this is that (he forgot what it was).

Ms. Fisher, on the same point, felt another benefit in this proposal is that this points to... she couldn't score it in certain areas but she feels it has a potential to be moved to utilization.

Mr. Dunn asked her what she meant.

[Too many people were talking at the same time.]

Mr. Olivas, for clarification, asked-how the panel would write the scoring of utilization or implementation. Is there a breakout on it?

Mr. Dunn said the RFA says up to two utilization projects; up to four planning and the remainder in implementation. The thing about it - the challenge of moving the category is that in the RFA the applicant decides rather than us which category they want their proposal to be in.

Ms. Burnett commented that after hearing the discussion she wondered if the applicant could request to change their category once they submitted the proposal. She said she wanted to ask that in a nice way.

The Facilitator said it was in the recommendations. That was submitted as a recommendation that it be submitted as a utilization proposal.

Mr. Dunn asked what her fellow panel members would say about that.

Mr. Berrens was okay with it being implementation and it was their choice and he didn't think the panel should change it. Our obligation is to evaluate them on the choice they made. I'm okay with it being implementation because I view this as attached to rehabilitation or restoration of the landscape. They're doing something on the ground so it doesn't necessarily fit cleanly with the typical utilization which often typically isn't doing anything on the ground. They are taking something from it and putting it back on the forest and testing it back on the forest. To me that is

the rehabilitation and restoration. A lot of these categories when we evaluate them are evaluating potential - potential for restoration - potential for reduction in waste, etc. I've been evaluating it on its linkages to those potentials. I can't tell anybody else how to evaluate it. But they asked us to evaluate it on implementation. I see this as a treatment on the ground and I evaluate it in that respect on its ability to rehabilitate landscape and restore landscape.

Mr. Dunn agreed that he is uncomfortable with changing a proposal's category just because the RFA made it clear that when you are applying... I use the analogy of ... each applicant is deciding the race that they want to run. I'm not going to tell them "no, I think you should run a marathon instead of a mile." They have signed up for the category they believe they are in and that's what we should review.

The Facilitator asked the panelists if they were okay leaving the category alone. She asked Ali if Mr. Racher's point was valid, based on the conversation.

Mr. Racher took it out.

The Facilitator closed discussion on that issue and moved on.

Mr. Gomez added a strength with new wording. *There is a potential to use erosion on a wild fire - burned areas as a new method for erosion control.*

The Facilitator checked in with Mr. Vincent. Where we left it was that folks are not encouraged to change the category they are in.

Mr. Vincent agreed with utilization because it is testing a new method for restoration.

Mr. Pohlman added language - *The District Ranger has provided a letter describing the projects and compliments them.*

Mr. Jervis asked, "Did we get 21 and 23 under Strengths? Could we add those and 33?

The Facilitator said #33 was there.

Mr. Jervis asked if 26 was relevant since they are treating areas that are not forest areas.

The panelists said yes.

Mr. Cooke asked to leave Ms. Burnett's recommendation where it was.

The Facilitator instructed the panelists to score this application and submit their scoring sheets.

Mr. Matush returned after the scoring was completed.

CFRP 30-11 – Sierra Soil & Water Conservation District

There were no conflicts of interest for this proposal

Project Number:	CFRP 30-11
Organization:	Sierra Soil & Water Conservation District
Organization Type:	State Government
Forest:	Gila
Project Title:	Implementation of Non-Native Phreatophyte Gasification Feasibility
Funding Requested:	$145,796
Matching funds:	$48,706
Total budget	$205,502
Evaluation Category:	Implementation

Ms. Ann Watson presented this project proposal.

It is a continuation of their 2003 CFRP grant. They will reduce the threat of high intensity wildfires and negative effects of excessive competition between trees in an urban interface by removing non-native phreatophytes and replant native vegetation on the east side of the Rio Grande just south of Socorro. The area is managed by BOR. The contractor would remove Salt Cedars mechanically and remains will be converted to electricity by a proven biomass system. This is one of the first versions of non-native species to be used in this biomass system. The remainder of downed material will be offered to the public. They anticipate 9 cords per acre. $150/cord would be close to $30,000 in firewood. They will replant with Gooding's Willow and Rio Grande Cottonwood once removal is finished.

Some partners are the Bureau of Reclamation, Sierra County Soil & Conservation District, Hot Springs High School, Sierra Club, Interstate Stream Commission, Surface Water Quality Bureau of NMED, and Sierra CWPP. This is a 2 year project

Panel Discussion

Mr. Barrone added Strengths #1-4, 6 and 8-14

Mr. Jervis added Strengths #15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22. He added Weaknesses #4, 5, 14, 16 and 19. He added Recommendations #25 and 26. Then he asked to take #26 out. He noted that there was no letter of support from the Sierra Club committing to the project. They talked about it but nothing was submitted.

Under Weakness #19, the plan did not monitor how much of the material would be removed (pages 9-10). It was not very clear what they would do in clearing this land. There were some very specific things they said they were going to do.

Mr. Matush had no problem with that weakness.

Mr. Jervis added Recommendations #3 and 8.

He added a Strength - *The project proposes to do all of its work in the winter which is important because of the existence of the Southwest Willow Flycatcher in this area.*

Mr. Racher added - *and avoids other nesting birds.*

Mr. Matush didn't have a problem and was not willing to debate issue safety of the use of pesticides. It is important. We do have two applicants here that probably have more experience, especially when it comes to the safety. One of them is Sierra who started this 8 years ago. The other application is from Carlsbad. They are certified experts in the use of herbicides with Salt Cedar now but I understand your point.

Mr. Racher said they didn't go into the issue of herbicide safety. He was not sure anyone knows their experience.

Mr. Matush was not willing to debate it but it was a point.

The Facilitator said it would remain in as a weakness because there was not enough detail.

Mr. Bird said they do have a decision.

Mr. Jervis didn't see it in the proposal.

Mr. Bird said it is in the proposal.

The Facilitator agreed to pull out Mr. Jervis's strength.

Mr. Matush asked to look at the strengths. Salt Cedar monitoring is not like forest monitoring. He did like that they had the stems and the ground cover and everything which is basically non-denimum for Salt Cedar because there is not much else. So he added Strength #31.

There is not a boilerplate strength but a strength is that if New Mexico needs to change the way they treat Salt Cedar, this is the method - to find a market for it. We have done this so many times in treating it without finding a market. David Old of Old Wood is the only other one who has done it. This is one example that could change the way we treat Salt Cedar. That is a strength.

Mr. Bird said they could take of the "if" because there was nothing iffy about the market.

He didn't see anything on air quality on this biomass. *He recommended that they include air quality monitoring from the biomass unit in their comprehensive evaluation.*

On page 2 they talk at length about a comprehensive evaluation in using Salt Cedar for a bio-fuel but I cannot find anywhere a discussion about air quality. They could have included specs on the machine at least and that would have answered that question.

Mr. Gomez asked the proponent what they would do with the root balls that have been mechanically removed.

Mary Jo Faht, manager for Sierra Soil and Water Conservation, said in the past we have done several of these types of projects and the BOR has come in with their machines and mulched most of it.

Sometimes the root balls bum up the machine so what we have left the local Fire Dept and BLM will burn them.

Mr. Gomez added Strengths #29 and 33.

He added a *recommendation to keep the title in the tribal letter the same as on the CFRP proposal*. The letter to the tribe had a different title from the CFRP Proposal.

Mr. Vincent asked if invasion of a non-native species part of the CFRP regulations.

Mr. Dunn said it is part of the statute. He read it from the first eligibility requirement.

Mr. Vincent commented that once the non-native species takes hold the wildlife use it. There are other things the wildlife gets used to using.

Mr. Jervis said the problem with Salt Cedar is that although it is true that Southwestern Willow Flycatchers do nest in the Salt Cedar - it does so because there is nothing else to nest in. Because Salt Cedar and Siberian Elm are invasive, they exclude the native vegetation for which the wildlife are better adapted.

Mr. Racher commented about the letter from Forest Service. Did we say the RFA doesn't require a letter from Forest Service?

Mr. Dunn didn't believe it was required in the RFA. That is especially so if not on Forest Service land.

Mr. Racher noted there is a letter from BOR. Since it isn't a requirement, maybe it is okay.

Mr. Dunn said if they are awarded a grant the Forest Service would have to administer the grant but it is not the line officer. That's the CFRP and the grant surveillance person. He couldn't remember what they said about that so he would look that up.

Mr. Pohlman said he would like to know if the BOR should supply a letter.

He added a new Strength - *A support letter has been provided by BOR.*
In their letter of support, the BLM commits to similar activities upstream from the project area and points out that treating entire watersheds will require collaborative efforts such as this one.

Mr. Dunn clarified that the RFA does not require a letter from the Forest Service.

Mr. Racher surmised then that as a recommendation it would require it of them.

Mr. Dunn said it is not a weakness but let's take it out.

Mr. Matush shared that he had walked right through this project and it is very thick there; that the fees are very conservative and the hourly wages for mechanical and herbicide treatments are reasonable.

There were no other comments. The Facilitator asked panelists to score the application and submit scoring forms.

Break -10:30 a.m. - 11: a.m.

CFRP 31-11 – Carlsbad Soil And Water Conservation District

There were no conflicts of interest for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 31-11
Organization:	Carlsbad Soil and Water Conservation District
Organization Type:	State Government
Forest:	Lincoln
Project Title:	McMillan Native Vegetation Restoration Project
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching funds:	$90,000
Total budget:	$450,000
Evaluation Category:	Implementation

Ms. Coleman Burnett presented the project summary.

This is from the proposal presented in 2009. The match is from the Carlsbad Soil and Water Conservation District, the Carlsbad Sportsman's Club and Chihuahua Desert Conservation Alliance. Other partners include the BOR, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Walthall Environmental and M&M Excavating, Inc.

It is a proposal for removal of non-native species located north of Brantley Lake. Game and Fish manages the area. Both agencies provided letters of support. The purpose is to reestablish native vegetation. On page 8, the proposal said USDA and USGS ecological survey showed the area was a rangeland - salty bottomland and the land form was a drainage way.

This is a 3 year proposal. M&M Excavating will remove non-native and an estimated 160 tons per acre of Salt Cedar will be ground and composted on site. After that the compost will be spread over the extracted area. The seed will be drilled into the compost. Sorghum is not native but proved successful. It will provide forage. M&M excavating will create 5 jobs from this project.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush added Strengths #1, 2, 10, 11. They do have sufficient measurements for Salt Cedar - Strength 31 adaptive approach. Also he added Strength #23 - budget detail and #22 - extensive expertise.

He added his own strength - *Using mulch and sorghum is good way to augment the sodium chloride or the salty nature of the soils down there*. That is also a problem on the Pecos.

Mr. Bird had a question on page 2 where the bottom paragraph confused him. The project area includes an area already reduced in 2006. He wondered if it just didn't take or if they were re-treating it.

Ms. Judy Ball said they are removing the Salt Cedar that grew back in there. The other thing is that precotia has come in. They found that extraction was the best method to deal with it.

Ms. Watson said for Strength #1 she didn't see any educational partner.

Mr. Matush said he didn't count the educational because he was familiar with this one. Carlsbad was probably as well educated as any of them. Like Sierra, this was their main focus. He acknowledged that it was an assumption but he thought the partners were good.

Mr. Racher noted there was a clarification on the evaluation criteria included. It was a new conservation program and education was not a requirement. They can be done without an educator there.

Ms. Watson countered that we have a component for educational outreach and it was not addressed.

Mr. Dunn said there is no requirement for educational outreach.

Mr. Matush added that all of the partners are somewhat educational. They've got Game and Fish and the Soil and Conservation District as well as the Carlsbad Sportsmen's Club and Chihuahua Desert Conservation Alliance. All of those are pretty much education in some form or another.

Ms. Watson asked how they monitor education outreach and training then.

Mr. Dunn said the multi-party monitoring as he said on the first day, the original intent of the requirement was to have a diverse and balance of stakeholders engaged in the project. They would be the multi-parties involved in the monitoring for the purpose of adaptive management and staying within the zone of agreement they have developed amongst each other. Many CFRP projects over the years have included multi-party monitoring, involving youth but was not foreseen in the original statute and is not a requirement. The only thing mentioned in the RFA or the act was the phrase he read earlier involving youth such as Youth Corps involved as part of the job training.

Mr. Racher understood the value was in the mulch, the byproduct.

The Facilitator thought it sounded like S-1 stays.

Mr. Dunn indicated the assumption in the past was that in diversity and balance you look at the advisory committee - that is a reasonable assumption.

Mr. Racher asked if it is a recommendation then.

Ms. Watson added the Recommendation that *the project could be strengthened by a stronger educational component.*

Mr. Olivas added on that note that the balanced group lacks tribal, county, land grant, etc.

Mr. Matush referred to page 5 and asked the panel to look at the list of stakeholders. He added Strength #16-regarding part of the integrated efforts. He explained it was only because he was familiar with the lower Pecos. It really is an integrated effort at restoration. All these stakeholders under V are actively engaged in this landscape effort to take out Salt Cedar down there. The Carlsbad Conservation District is really the key integral player in those efforts, like Sierra on these efforts. He clarified it was on page 5 of 10 where it said Stakeholders in the Management Plan in the back. All of the stakeholders were actively involved in the effort to remove the Salt Cedar from the area there.

The Facilitator asked Mr. Olivas if we should take out Weakness #2.

Mr. Olivas said yes.

Mr. Jervis questioned that this was restoration. He considered it to be reclamation with the sorghum.

Mr. Racher said with the mulch and the sorghum augments the sodium chloride to make the bristle grass and all the other seed mixtures, much easier for it to come in. Some people say that Salt Cedar tends to collect more salt but everything makes that happen. You have to add enough organic matter so you can make a proper seed bed. And the sorghum helps augment that so your native vegetation species can come back in. The sorghum is just an annual so you provide root mass so your next seed go around will be easier because it is so high in hydrogen and sodium chloride.

Mr. Bird added Strength #17 - being a sort of cover crop; *the sorghum allows native crops to get started so another strength is an innovative use of the woody by-products that restores native vegetation in a difficult environment.*

Mr. Gomez added Strengths #28 and 29.

He added a new Strength. *On pages 2-3 of the proposal, Table 2, describes past federally funded projects between the Carlsbad SWCD and BLM Carlsbad Field Office. This table also includes the current status of these projects. Both entities have established a history of collaboration and implementation of projects within the Pecos River watershed.*

Mr. Dunn asked if they were federally funded grant programs which were different.

Mr. Gomez said it was a mixture. Mr. Dunn was okay with “federally funded.”

Mr. Gomez didn’t find a letter to the tribes but did find a letter of response from Ysleta del Sur Pueblo. He asked the panel members if that would suffice for this project. It looks like they did contact the tribes but they don’t have a list of tribes they contacted. Mescalero would be next door. They should have a sample contact letter to the tribes.

Mr. Matush thought it was important but in this particular case there are no tribes within the receiving waters - that would be actually in Texas. If anybody is a receiving water or water shed then the tribes would need to be involved. But here, only Texas would be involved in what they are doing besides the City of Carlsbad.

Ms. Watson commented that all of this land used to be Indian land.

Mr. Dunn said the tribes identified in the appendix for the Lincoln are Ysleta del Sur and Mescalero Apache and Isleta. That is a forest-wide list and I would have to defer to Ann or a preservation officer to figure out which areas are affected.

Mr. Matush agreed that Ms. Watson is right. That is the way we treated the others, to be fair.

Ms. Burnett agreed.

Mr. Racher said it would be Weakness #6.

Mr. Dunn countered that this was not the same. They have a letter from Isleta Pueblo so that is some indication of contact. It is not the same as some proposal that has no letter like we saw yesterday - that had no indication that they consulted with the tribes. Unlike many other proposals, they actually have a letter coming back from a tribe.

Mr. Racher asked if we could hear from the applicant.

Ms. Ball said they did send letters out to the tribes that were listed under Lincoln Forest and for the previous proposals; she submitted a list and sample letter in the previous proposal. She included it in the application.

Mr. Payne wrote - *The application didn't include documentation of consultation with all the tribes listed in the RFA for the Lincoln National Forest however there is a letter from Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo indicating the proponent had been in contact with them regarding this specific project.*

Mr. Dunn said, "This, to me, is a lot better than what we usually have. It is not the same as when they did not consult. It is clear evidence from this letter that they had contact with a tribe. I'm okay with this the way it is. I'm just saying it is not like a proposal that has not evidence. You, in fact, have evidence that they were communicating with tribes. That's all I'm saying. It is a response letter, even. You don't have copies of all the letters they sent the tribes but you have an actual response letter back that says - hey, thanks for contacting us."

Mr. Jervis added Strength # 4, 6, 7, 22 and 16. And he added Weaknesses #3, 13 and 19. He also added Recommendations #25 and 26.

Mr. Matush noted this was one of the biggest problems, kind of like Sierra, where you have a lake that is highly flushable - this is the hardest. You are right that it doesn't add significantly to the landscape efforts but the potential for learning and education on something that goes up and down - the water tables go up and down. This is the hardest place to...

Mr. Jervis asked if this place was flooded. He had the impression that it was flooded.

Mr. Matush said no but with anything around a lake the water tables go up and down and it is a very hard thing to treat next to the lake because the wildlife issue and all this kind of stuff. It becomes a learning issue because it treatment around a lake for Salt Cedar is such a sensitive thing but you are right about the total landscape effort. It could add to the total landscape effort because of what you learn in the process. Salt Cedar is such a headache to get rid of.

Mr. Jervis thought there needs to be some long term monitoring of Salt Cedar beyond the life of the project for return of Salt Cedar. A lot of these projects tend to remove it and then walk away. There needs to be a longer term monitoring. There is plenty of seed source. Too many removal projects do that and walk away and they come back.

Mr. Jervis added Recommendations #2, 3, 4 and 16. He saw that we already have #2.

Mr. Payne asked if on the weakness - it lacks detail.

Mr. Jervis said yes.

Mr. Racher said youth is not a required component but on page 5 they say they have outreach and talk about having brochures and presenting that stuff.

Mr. Jervis agreed with that and asked to pull Recommendation #3.

The Facilitator asked if there was a comment on #19.

Mr. Racher said it was on #13. The ability to demonstrate this, if it works, especially for the lower Rio Grande and the big portions of Pecos River, could be very important for reestablishing native species in a system. In this one, I don't know if we can do it on the significant costs of the thing. But when you are doing some acres - this is going to be an innovative thing.

Mr. Matush agreed. The more we learn, the more it adds.

Mr. Jervis - "But they said they already demonstrated that this works - so this is not a demonstration. It's already been demonstrated.

Mr. Matush agreed. He couldn't argue that point.

Mr. Racher said they had not demonstrated the mulching with sorghum.

Mr. Matush thought the mulching idea was fairly new.

Mr. Jervis thought somewhere in this discussion they stated that they had shown or demonstrated that sorghum worked. He asked the proponent if this crop process of mulching and sorghum has been demonstrated before.

Ms. Ball said in paragraph 5 on page 5 at the top. About midway down the paragraph we talked about when BOR had used it in test plots within the area.

Mr. Matush said he had used it in the gas fields around Hobbs. He had done it before.

Ms. Ball said the process with the composting of Salt Cedar is actually a new component including putting the mulch out within the lake bed. We have not done that yet. That is a new step that we are looking at trying to implement the soil because it is a dried up lake bed.

Mr. Jervis asked if the sorghum is an annual so it would reseed itself.

Ms. Ball said it would up to a maximum of 3 years.

Mr. Jervis said then he would recant #13.

Mr. Pohlman questioned the long term and asked if that would be a weakness or a recommendation. They do have a monitoring plan for what they are going to do.

Mr. Matush thought he could convince them that because of the compacts we have with Texas, this whole thing started when Charles Hart started killing alluvial gains after they started trying to control the Salt Cedar on the Pecos in Texas. So New Mexico has tried the same thing. And the reason we got all these monies eight to ten years ago was to try to bring up the alluvial gain on the surface flow. You can't see the surface flow. We might see the alluvial. But this has been long term just because of the compact and the threat of the Salt Cedar taking our water. So I don't see this long term going away just because of the water in the compacts we have with Texas. And that's the way it has always been since this was initiated.

Mr. Payne asked if he was saying take this out.

Mr. Matush said his suggestion was that it is not a weakness only because he knew the background.

Mr. Jervis agreed to take out Weakness #19.

Mr. Pohlman had a Strength. *There is a support letter from the BLM.*

Mr. Matush asked if everybody was okay to take out the long term weakness statement.

The panelists agreed.

Mr. Dunn suggested that they remove the recommendation about a letter from the forest since they have no land management interest in this.

The Facilitator asked to review the items.

Panelists were asked to complete and turn in their scoring sheets.

The Panelists agreed to do one more review before lunch.

The Facilitator reminded the panel that public comments would be heard before they broke for lunch.

CFRP 32-11 – Ohkay Owingeh

There were no conflicts of interest for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 32-11
Organization:	Ohkay Owingeh
Organization Type:	Tribe
Forest:	Santa Fe
Project title:	Sustainable riparian forest Restoration at Ohkay Owingeh and Orilla Verde Recreation Area
Funding Requested:	$316,152
Matching Funds:	$99,038
Total budget:	$415,190
Evaluation Category:	Implementation

Mr. Barrone presented the project summary.

The NEPA is completed. They received three previous grants that were successfully completed. They mentioned the upper cost for treating riparian vs. upland forest. Protecting the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and habitat for New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mice is the objective. Collaborators were listed. The project would provide ten new jobs and 20 young people would be trained. The main problem addressed is loss of habitats and biodiversity loss. This would decrease fire risk for wildlife in the area. It would involve basic trees on the banks of the Rio Grande.

Of all the proposals he read, this was easiest to read and everything was straightforward. That was a strength of it.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush added a *Strength that their fees and prices are admirable, conservative and in line; reasonable instead of admirable.*

He added Strength #2 - Old wood has come up again and is a plus for them. They are taking Salt Cedar and using it as a high-end wood material - a marketable material

He also added Strength #17 and 18.

Mr. Pohlman added Strength #13 - they actually talk about natural fire in riparian areas.

Mr. Barrone added Strength #3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 23, 21 and 24. Overall it was a well written proposal and he appreciated the clarity it demonstrated.

Mr. Olivas added Strength #12, 22, 26 and 29. He asked if there was evidence of the project preserving large and old trees.

Mr. Pohlman read where large trees would be preserved on page 4. That would be Strength #15.

Mr. Gomez added Strength #33 and 16. He added a Recommendation - *The project would be strengthened by a letter of support from the BIA indicating completion of NEPA.* There was a FONSI but no letter of support from the BIA.

Mr. Jervis added Strength #1, 4, 22 (already added) and 30. My understanding of this project is that this is truly implementation. There is nothing new in there. He asked if that was a correct interpretation.

Mr. Matush said they have some restoration of plant materials. That was going to be my next question but go ahead.

Mr. Jervis - my question is whether it is a boilerplate weakness. It goes back to capacity.

Mr. Matush didn't know.

The Facilitator asked if anyone had feedback on that.

Mr. Berrens thought so. It is instructive that they are also going to evaluate the cost/effectiveness of the control of invasive trees without herbicides which has had some success. And they believe they can make it more effective and more cost effective. And I actually saw that as the value added part.

Mr. Jervis - Can I just finish? I had two Recommendations - #3 and 16.

Mr. Payne - Recommendation #3 is not needed so just take it out.

Mr. Berrens said in response to that, he would add as a Strength - *The Project will evaluate cost effectiveness of control of invasive trees without herbicides.*

Mr. Racher added Strengths #11 and 22. They do have experience in those areas and I am a big proponent of non-herbicide control of non-native trees. But they say they will either cut or pull out - but cutting is not effective.

The Facilitator asked if he was proposing additional language on Strength 11 of something different.

Mr. Racher asked to take out Strength #11. It is not even a new thing and useless to just cut down non-natives.

Mr. Jervis was okay with that.

Mr. Racher was kind of okay with Strength 22.

Mr. Racher added a Recommendation - *Cutting as a follow-up treatment to re-sprouts is not an effective means for control and proponents should concentrate on mechanical removal that removes roots, even if it is by hand.* He explained that cutting meant cutting that removes the roots.

Mr. Matush asked for help from the applicant - Does this area for under water ever from snow melt flooding?

Mr. Dave Morgan, with La Calandria Associates, said yes, some parts of the treatment had been completely under water, depending on the run off that year. But most of the treatment area is not regularly flooded.

Mr. Matush - That's the only problem I have with this is the disturbance of flooding if the holes are under water, it will rip up everything if it goes under water. It is a concern - if they start pulling the roots out mechanically and it goes under water, it could end up taking out that whole bank. Once you pull it up out of the ground and leave those holes, it becomes so loose and disturbed that the chance of taking out that whole bank increases.100% almost.

Mr. Morgan – asked if that was for the non-herbicide method.

Mr. Matush - agreed.

Mr. Morgan - That's what we are looking at for non-native species.

Mr. Racher - Are they going to plant grass?

Mr. Matush - Well, go ahead and finish because that was going to be my next question.

Mr. Racher commented that one of the things noticeably missing is the Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance.

Mr. Payne asked if that was a weakness.

Mr. Racher agreed. *The Greater Rio Grande Watershed Alliance is the regional collaborative that is performing non-native phreatophyte control in this area and the project gave no evidence of their cooperation.*

Mr. Racher added a Weakness - *There is not any letter from sub-awardees (Boss Reclamation and the mulching contractor) included*.

Mr. Racher said the recommendation would be - *The application could be strengthened by collaboration with the regional alliance.*

Mr. Matush asked Dave Morgan about plant materials - If it has been under water, do you know if you are working inside the ordinary high water mark designated by the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. Morgan said very little of the ordinary treatment area would be below the high water mark. Both treatment areas go right up to the river so there will be some merging along the treatment area that would be included. The huge majority of the area would not be within the ordinary high water mark that regularly flooded at this point.

Mr. Matush - I didn't see a letter from the Corps. I would make a recommendation that you might want to check with the Corps before you get heavy equipment in there.

Morgan agreed - Oh we certainly have in the past. We will check with the Corps and be careful about that.

Mr. Matush said under plant materials, $18 for 50 lbs has to be commercial.

Mr. Morgan felt it was about average. It is in line with commercial grass seeds and mixes.

Mr. Matush concluded they were not using pure live seed but using commercial.

Mr. Morgan agreed. Typically we work it out with the kind of use of grass seed, etc.

Mr. Matush asked what the plugs were.

Mr. Morgan said they were herbaceous plant material taken from native wetland nurseries.

Mr. Matush thought that was wonderful.

Mr. Luján said they needed to stabilize the surface to keep the banks stabilized there.

Mr. Dunn requested clarification from the coordinator or the applicant the weakness concerning the letters from sub-awardees.

Mr. Morgan said the reason a specific letter from a specific contractor was not included was that we were not entirely sure how the sub-awardee vs. going out for bid was supposed to work and didn't want to prejudge that too much. We spoke with them to make sure costs were reasonable but didn't want to presume at this stage of the project that was going to do everything.

Mr. Dunn asked if the point was there was just one letter missing. Is that correct?

Mr. Morgan said it was certainly possible that Boss could do both the mechanical extraction and the mulching as needed. Our assumption was that we would bid it out.

Mr. Dunn said the point is that under other, where the sub awardees would be, only one letter is missing.

Ms. Burnett added that after that, *the letters from the partners Ohkay Owingeh, Boys & Girls Club, Amigos Bravos and Audubon didn't define budget requests (match).*

Given that, the panel took out Strength #4.

The Facilitator reviewed the panel's strengths, weaknesses and recommendations. She asked the panelists to complete the scoring sheets.

The Facilitator reminded them that criteria were not on the scoring sheet.

Public Comment Period

At 12:00 pm, the Facilitator invited any present who had submitted public comments to read their own if they wished.

Mr. Dunn read the first public comment.

The first comment is from Michael Forrey and if submitted a corrected CFRP F424 A. As with tribal letters, it doesn't get added to the proposal. We can include it in the notes but it is not... it doesn't get added to the proposal. If they are recommended for funding they will have to correct this.

The Facilitator said she would read the rest of the comments.

This is for CFRP 23-11: Greetings, Technical Advisory Panel. I respectfully would like to indicate that in your review of my proposal ... This is from Alfonso Chávez III... I was given boilerplate weakness number 17 that the volume of restoration by-products was unclear. Budget pages 4, 8 and 10 indicate the volume of restoration byproduct wood products are indicated under heading H - Other Please consider removing that weakness from the proposal review based on this information. Sincerely, Alfonso Chávez III, CFRP proponent, 23-11. 23-11 - Chacón.

This is from proposal 02-11: My name is Anthony Madrid. I'm the new Ranger in the Canjilon Ranger District. I have a couple of comments on proposal 02-11. I was here Monday but was unable to stay for the review of this proposal due to prior obligations. Monday was a very long day. I took a good while to work through the new worksheet process. I think everyone was tired and it was difficult to work through the first two proposals. I hope this didn't diminish the strengths and importance of this project. I really, really want to emphasize my support for this proposal. I truly believe this is a top-notch proposal. Santa Fé Firewood and Landscaping is a well established business with a huge demand for firewood. Santa Fé F&L is functioning very well. It is not just a plan or an idea. Santa Fé F&L is looking for assistance to build upon current capacity to expand their already strong, well established firewood market. This will enable Santa F&L to bid on future FS projects and have a sustainable business. The Canjilon District has two landscape projects that are NEPA cleared and ready to implement several cultural... treatments on over 13,000 acres. We also have a huge landscape project the Cebolla/ Nutrias in the NEPA process. This project covers over 100,000 acres of FS, BLM, State and private land. The Canjilon District has a huge

need for a long-term outlet for small diameter timber. We believe Santa Fé F&L would be an excellent candidate to provide this long-term outlet and this is why we support this proposal so much. The Canjilon Ranger District is heavily focused on hazardous fuels reduction, forest woodland ecosystem restoration and improved watershed health. Back in 2002, the Montoya Wildfire burned 5000+ acres just east of Canjilon. In order to reduce the potential for wildfire around the community of Canjilon, we planned and completed the NEPA for the Canjilon project. We will be implementing this project this fall. We believe Santa Fé F&L can provide significant assistance to Carson on forest health. We hope you find this project worthy of funding. Anthony Madrid, Canjilon Ranger District.

This is from David Old submitted on behalf of the Lloyd Irland Group- Dear David, The Irland Group is pleased to collaboration with Old Wood, LLC in a 2011 CFRP program for advanced production of growing from small diameter timber. We agree to perform stakeholder outreach, training and teaching functions to be coordinated with monitoring functions to include coordinated criteria of importance to the tribes, stakeholders and Old Wood as well as other collaborators such as Peace and Justice. We will include impacts on local economies, quality of life and work issues and rankings and other pertinent socio-economic data as well as hard metrics such as dollar amounts, quantities of material use, estimated acres treated, and impacts on cost per acre to thin, and possible outcomes and improvements going forward. Coordination of stakeholders and a detailed work plan will be produced in year 1. Total charges billable to Old Wood, LLC will be $1,500 in Year 1, $3,500 in Year 2. This will be a total of $5,000 which will cover work time at $50 per hour and one trip to New Mexico at a mutually agreed time to conduct field work. We appreciate the opportunity to be involved in this potentially ground breaking work with you and your collaborators such as the Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute, the Forest Guild and your tribal and social partners. Sincerely, Lloyd C. Irland, President of the Irland Group. That was for CFRP 09-11.

This is for the same proposal (09-11) This is from the Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute. Dear Mr. Old. This letter is submitted as an addition to our February 25, 2011 letter o commitment for the CFRP 2011 grant application submitted by Old Wood. The New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute has agreed to provide the following support related to project monitoring and outreach. Assist with social and economic monitoring and with assessing the impacts of the project on the region's forest, host progress and the outcomes of the project on the NMFWRI's website, develop and publish an NMFWRI fact sheet summarizing lessons learned, participate in meetings of the multi-party monitoring team. This support will be provided based upon $50 per hour for 30 hours each year. This will be $1,500 for each of the three years of the grant period with a total of $4,500. THE NMFWRI looks forward to working with you on the multi-party monitoring team to help make this important project a success. Sincerely, Andrew Eagen PhD, Director Professor, NMFWRI, Box 900, Las Vegas, New Mexico. 87701.

This one is for CFRP 30-11 - The Sierra Soil and Water Conservation District has historically worked very closely with the Sierra Club on numerous forest and bosque restoration projects. The Sierra SWCD began developing this proposal for resubmission; recontacted the local chapter president. She, Margo Wilson, verbally gave her support and committed to give a letter of support. However, when the time came close for the grant proposals submission she was out of the US and was not able to provide a support letter. When we realized we could not get a letter from the Sierra Club we approached the Audubon New Mexico, a recent bosque restoration partner, for a letter of support. That letter was included in the proposal.

To the CFRP Panel specific to Proposal 27-11 - I would like to clarify some issues concerning administrative observations and weaknesses brought forth by the panel.

Administrative Observations: SF424 shows the wrong amount of federal funds requested. We discovered the error at the end of March. We immediately contacted our CFRP Grant Coordinator Gabe Partido at the Gila National Forest. Mr. Partido then contacted the regional office with the corrected numbers. Corrected SF forms were resubmitted.

Education Block listed as $6,000 times three years does not appear to be an individual, thus should not be listed under personnel.

Refer to budget years 1, 2, and 3 under personal were computations are listed as $25 x 16 hours x 15 people = $6,000. This total would represent in-kind funds from Jose Barrios Staff members.

All personnel have full-time duties and it may not be prudent to use grant funds totaling $141,176.
You are correct that each member of the team has full-time duties that they must complete as an educator. The CFRP would require added duties that may not be addressed during their regular school day which would require members of the team to stay additional hours to complete CFRP tasks.

Project Director is Principal for the school.
As Jose Barrios Principal, my responsibility and first priority is to insure the successful overall operation of my school. If awarded the CFRP grant, this would be my second priority that would come with added duties that would be carried out after my school workday is complete. Mr. Dick Pool, Superintendent of Silver Consolidated Schools, has made very clear to all principals that no outside business may be conducted during school time.

No clear explanation of duties (added duties) to each personnel to understand how the computation was derived.

Project Director duties include: verifying grant time sheets, justify to fiscal agent all purchases, correspondence, verify project objectives are met in a timely manner.

Project Manager/Outreach duties include: coordinating logistic of purchasing, supplies maintenance, crews, deliveries/outreach include community involvements, public presentations, outreach to other schools and all other duties assigned.

Administrative Assistant duties include: Shipping and receiving of grant materials and correspondence.

Outdoor Educational Planner duties include: create lessons to be used by Jose Barrios teachers, other schools and the public.

Monitoring Coordinator: create monitoring forms to ensure uniform data collection, maintain database, and insure monitoring objectives are being met.

Why are separate cars charged to mileage all three years for attending CFRP workshop?
Costs were added in to insure funds were available in case both attendees are covered if starting points were at different locations outside of Grant County.

Number of cameras seems excessive (5) at 1 per grade level.

As listed on page 3 of the three-year budget narrative, two class per grade level averaging twenty students, which would only give one camera per 40 students. It also states that 250 students and staff will share all monitoring equipment.

Computers/printer at 1 per grade.
Computers are requested at one per grade. There is only one printer requested on budget narrative on page 3.

Computers-printers should be distributed to the central service cost allocation for the school.
The school allocated computers and printers currently run on Windows 95 which would not be compatible with Forest Service computer systems - that would not be compatible monitoring data. As listed on page 3 of the three-year budget narrative, two classes per grade level averaging twenty students which would only give one computer per 40 students. It also states that 250 students and staff will share all monitoring equipment.

$200-hour for chipping/tree grooming/project consulting seems excessive.
As in appendix C letter of support states services.

No computations for Silver City Public Works Department.
As in appendix C, letters of support, the Town of Silver City described types of services to be contributed but did not give a complete breakdown.

Accounting Services from Laws and Company, LLC shows no computations and seems to be a duplication of services with school personnel.
Due to the large amount of monies requested, we felt that a check and balance system (as stated on page 4 of the three-year budget narrative) should be in place to insure proper use of public funds.

No computations for NMED Surface Water Quality Bureau ($11,000) as match.
Letter in appendix C from NMED states that "we will be available approximately one day a month" to do a variety of monitoring and plan assistance totaling approximately $11,000.

Weakness 16:
YCC Crews and Town of Silver City will do employees who have received safety training work. Snedaker enterprises who will be removing trees and doing the chipping is a licensed and bonded company.

Weakness 18:
On page 2 under partners paragraph is stated that we would consult with New Mexico Environment Department. To develop erosion control plan and restoration treatment to insure erosion on site is minimized. This is stated as our first objective on page 3, last paragraph.

Weakness 2:
Letter was sent to Nature Conservancy addressed to Martha S. Cooper on January 21, 2011 inviting them to collaborate with Jose Barrios on this project. Numerous emails and phone calls were made in the attempt to receive an answer. On February 24 we were told to pick up a letter at her office door and the letter in the grant proposal is Nature Conservancy's response. She deferred to Lone Mountain Natives who is one of our partners. Letter is found in Appendix C.

Signed by Michael Koury.

32-11 regarding the Ohkay Owingeh project. This is from David Morgan, La Calandria Associates.

Specific cost and budget figures were not included in partner support/commitment letters for CFRP 32-11 because we (the project partners) were no aware that they were required for non-cash match budget items. In light of this, we respectfully request consideration of removal of this as a weakness in evaluating this proposal.

Lunch- 12:15 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.

The Facilitator noted there were two more applications to process.

CFRP 33-11 – Los Amigos De Valles Caldera

There were no conflicts of interest for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 33-11
Organization:	Los Amigos de Valles Caldera
Organization Type:	Non-Profit
Forest:	Santa Fe
Project Title:	Restoring Ponderosa Pine and Xeric Mixed Conifer Stands on the Valles Caldera National Preserve - A Paired-Watershed Implementation Project.
Funding Requested:	$360,000
Matching funds:	$90,000
Total budget:	$450,000
Evaluation Category:	Implementation

Bob Berrens presented the project summary.

It involves treatments in the Valles Caldera National Preserve watershed and uses the adjacent watershed as a control. Following a prescribed fire it uses volunteers from the Santa Clara tribe and Los Amigos de Valles Caldera. Contracts include FS corrections crew, youth for piling materials. Santa Clara is doing the controlled fire by their burn crew. He listed the collaborators in the project.

Three monitoring crew members are to be hired and trained by the New Mexico Endemic Salamander Team and all monitoring would be overseen by a monitoring team including a coordinator from VCNP and the Nature Conservancy.

He listed their seven objectives. It will become a demonstration for further projects. Mechanical thinning at low elevations will be done and it is based on principles for the Jemez Mountain Collaborative Forest Restoration Program. It is unique for doing this through the whole watershed. A variety of funding included a previous CFRP funded project. It will provide 3 full day educational field trips of high school students to be selected. Multi-party includes ecological monitoring for bird species, insects, water quality and economic development.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Matush asked Barbara Johnson (proponent) for a clarification. Is the control site also south facing?

Ms. Barbara Johnson is Vice President of Los Amigos said it was.

Mr. Matush liked paired watershed studies and would like to see more of them so they could learn a lot. It says you are going to have water quality data and discharge data. Is Arizona willing to camp out at the flumes?

Ms. Johnson said they have made a long term commitment to help us with monitoring through the project.

Mr. Matush didn't see a letter from the Science Group saying they were going to put out these sounds at a certain frequency. It said something about a science group and I wasn't sure what people you were talking about. They were going to do the sounds and flume and discharge. I was looking for a letter from that particular group that says yes, we are going to be operating there and downloading on a certain frequency.

Ms. Johnson said there was one there.

Mr. Matush asked if that was the one from Jon Chorover.

Ms. Johnson agreed.

Mr. Matush noted the letter said they had been collecting that information and would be willing to share that data and making the data accessible. To be fair with all proponents it needs to add that as a recommendation. It would be good to have something in there that says they would monitor the streams at a certain frequency and they will be maintaining those flumes.

Ms. Johnson said they will monitor water quality through VCNP.

Mr. Matush guessed this would be up in the water shed where it would be intermittent. Or will they be down in that perennial river area where the water shed drains?

Ms. Johnson's reply was inaudible.

The Facilitator said the recommendation was that *it would have been helpful to have the information regarding the frequency of the monitoring for the paired watersheds.*

Mr. Matush your perennial is at the bottom. Where are they putting the sounds?

Ms. Johnson did not have that information. Right now they do have the equipment for that.

Mr. Matush thought it would be nice to see more detail on those flumes. And more detail on how they are going to do the sounds and more detail on the existing conditions there before fluming.

The recommendation is to have detail on existing condition of the stand prior to treatment.

Mr. Matush added Strengths #1, 2 and 6,

Ms. Virginia Pointeau clarified on the NEPA that we have the decision document. It was not completed when we submitted. She had a copy of the document with her and read the last paragraph - 101.6 that said it was the decision that this project falls under the category 101.6 which is categorical exclusion.

Mr. Matush added Strength #12, 16 and 23.

Mr. Jervis asked for a point of clarification. This same area is covered by the National Landscape Restoration Project. Is this activity not covered by that project or a supplement to it? I don't understand the interaction of the two.

Ms. Pointeau said it is not covered by the National Landscape Restoration Project. The CFL covers the lower elevations for the next five years. This is addressing south facing slopes from bottom all the way up to the top. It was something that was not in their plans.

Mr. Jervis thought it did.

Mr. Bird said he was involved in that CFLRP too. All of this research will help to inform when the CFLRA on how that will be done. My experience has been that they would get $40 million over 10 years. There are other types of restoration including riparian.

Mr. Jervis said that plan addresses mixed conifers in the forest.

Mr. Bird said they have a list of existing NEPA.

Mr. Jervis said they have a NEPA for the whole thing. Mr. Bird disagreed.

Mr. Gomez added a Strength - *It is very good to see that the proponent included an attached map with the letter to the tribes.* He had not seen that before

He added Strengths #3, 4, 14, 15, 21, 22 and 24.

Mr. Gomez added a Weakness - *On the letter of commitment from Santa Clara Pueblo it showed $19,306 and in the proposal showed $28,750.* He wanted that discrepancy clarified.

Ms. Johnson didn't know what it was.

Mr. Bird noted on Strength #13, *they speak to criterion 2 and noted that the proposal actually includes a burn plan and crew to implement it. This mixed conifer issue has been a big issue and this project will help us figure that out.*

Ms. Watson added that the proponent does have a letter of support from the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. Barrone had a question. Once the stems are on the ground, how will you get out the litter? You talk about people using that firewood. It is hard to get onto the Valles Caldera.

Mr. Racher in response said on page 6, first paragraph of the utilization component, it says that local volunteers over a weekend will pull that wood out.

Mr. Barrone asked what the volunteers would use to do that.

Ms. Johnson said we will be cutting some of that up. Los Amigos volunteers will cut it up and take it down logging roads to a main road where the Trust will allow people to pick it up. The roads up to the treatment roads are almost impassable either with horses or trucks. But you can get on the preserve without a permit.

Mr. Barrone wasn't convinced.

Mr. Matush asked Ms. Pointeau to show the Panel where the site was located on the map on page 12.

Ms. Pointeau showed the location.

Mr. Barrone said it is a Weakness. *It is unclear how the byproduct will be extracted*.

Mr. Matush was okay with that.

Mr. Racher added Strengths #8, 10 and 11.

Mr. Racher added Weakness #2 - collaborating with industry and commodity groups, and Weakness #17.

He also added a weakness that later was changed to a Recommendation - *In order to accomplish landscape scale forest restoration, proponent needs to begin strongly to collaborate with commodity interests and industry to meet those objectives.* He noted that the work being done is actually by a work crew coming in. That would be fine as long as it doesn't compete with what industry provides.

Mr. Jervis added Strengths #3, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15. (Only 7 were not included already). He also added Strengths #19, 21, 24, 30, and 33.

He had a question for the proponent - I try to follow the Stewardship Register and find it hard to believe the NEPA is done. I just checked it and this is not in the Stewardship Register.

Ms. Pointeau said she didn't know about that but did bring the letter.

Mr. Dunn asked if it was in the packet.

The Facilitator clarified that it just came.

Ms. Pointeau said what she brought was the decision document.

Mr. Jervis countered that public scoping was mentioned in the proposal but it is not listed.

Ms. Johnson said they took the comments from the scoping on CFLRP. I think this project is not in the CFLRP but they used the scoping comments they got from CFLRP for this.

The Facilitator asked if there was a recommendation.

Mr. Jervis responded, having clarified that to add Recommendations #3, 5 and 16.

Mr. Pohlman asked about the burning - Is that pile burning or broadcast burning?

Ms. Pointeau said it was pile burning.
Mr. Pohlman asked if the CE that was done included broadcast burning.

Ms. Johnson said it was to be only pile burning.

Mr. Pohlman said there were strengths relative to the reintroduction of natural fire - the burning and then reintroduction of fire and one of those may be inconsistent.

Mr. Bird said the management is very committed to re-establish natural fire regimes. For the strengths we could just take out #13.

Mr. Matush said, given the people involved, #22 is a strength if not already included.

The Facilitator confirmed that it was already included.

Mr. Matush said youth would be involved so Strength #8 should be added. (It was already included).

Mr. Gomez commented on Recommendation #3 that there is a letter from VCP that supports the proposals.

Mr. Payne asked - Why would you need one from Santa Fé?

Mr. Dunn said that was not a requirement.

So W-3 is taken off.

Mr. Dunn said that was true and on Friday needed to discuss whether to put this in the boilerplate for the RFA.

Mr. Jervis agreed they should remove it from the boilerplate.

Mr. Jervis noted there was some pretty substantial cost in here for housing and the VC has an education center that has housing. Is there a reason why you didn't use that facility for your housing needs?

Ms. Pointeau said the VC has costs there also but we wanted to support the local economy. It is less costly to house our field teams locally than to drive back and forth. So instead of paying that cost to VC we wanted to support the local community.

Mr. Jervis didn't question that. It was okay.

Mr. Jervis noted that Jemez Pueblo has a small wood products operation. Is there a reason you didn't use them?

Ms. Pointeau said it was mainly because of the cost issue.

Mr. Berrens said we should discuss that a little more. In Item #4, a letter from the Trust says housing would be available for your use including service for your staff.

Mr. Bird contended that doesn't mean that would be free.

Mr. Jervis asked if they will charge for it.

Mr. Bird said their costs are pretty high.

Ms. Johnson said the Center will be used for outreach and training of the demonstration project and for housing Los Amigos people when they are up there. They are not giving it free.

Mr. Racher considered Strength # 4 is accurate the way they worded it but ... Put it in although the budget amounts are not accurate.

Mr. Vincent added Weakness #17. It seems like most of the things on utilization didn't seem accurate but he favored taking it out. He added that the slopes are steep.

Mr. Jervis said they are taking wood out.

Mr. Vincent thought the amount left is very small.

Mr. Payne clarified that the weakness is that they don't provide the detail on it to know what they are doing there.

The Facilitator noted a consensus to leave Weakness #17 in there.

Mr. Cooke asked for a clarification from the presenter. According to Logistic Six, the resources on Redondo Peak - Is there a typo there regarding Redondo Peak? He said it was on page 3, #6 near the bottom says you will protect cultural resources but most of the proposed work is not on that peak. So you really think that is going to protect those resources on Redondo Peak?

Ms. Johnson said the largest concentration of resources will be on Redondo Peak. It is likely to have benefit for all kinds of resources but the largest are on Redondo Peak.

The Facilitator went through a review of Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations.

She asked the panel to complete the scoring sheets.

CFRP 34-11 – Pueblo Of Jemez

There were no conflicts of interests for this proposal.

Project Number:	CFRP 34-11
Organization:	Pueblo of Jemez
Organization Type:	Tribe
Forest:	Santa Fé
Project Title:	Forest Thinning and Habitat enhancement
Funding Requested:	$357,317
Matching Funds:	$75,590
Total Budget:	$432,906
Evaluation Category:	Implementation

Mr. Bird presented the project summary. This is a three-year project to manually thin and enhance nearly 200 acres of pueblo land using forest crews in the Hondo Canyon area adjacent to forest land. In year two, they will manually thin 20 acres of sagebrush in Jack Rabbit Flats. They anticipate 20 cords per acre and 100 fence posts. The remainder of residue will be left for erosion control. There will be a secondary education opportunity.

Jemez Pueblo is a primary partner of the CFLRP. I like that it is partly preparing for the 15,000 acre prescribed burn in NEPA right now. The Santa Fé Officer has been trying for this burn for years. So leveraging this burn is a real plus.

Panel Discussion

Mr. Barrone added Strengths #1, 2, 3, 8 and 10.

He added a Weakness that - *In the letter from Pueblo of Jemez second to last paragraph the use of salvage following the prescribed burn and should be **before** the prescribed burn.*

Mr. Racher thought that before the burn they would remove some but not all of the wood could be removed so any left after the burn they would use.

Mr. Barrone still felt it was a weakness.

Ms. Burnett added Strengths #7, 12, 16, 21 and 24.

She added Weakness #31 - it was addressed but the NEPA was not part of the application. It is a weakness because something could happen and NEPA not be possible.
Ms. Watson also had a concern in that regard that they would not get that done in time to have the project finished.

Mr. Racher added Strengths #4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 23.

He added Weakness # 25 and would put it in Administrative Observations. His other Administrative Observation was that the indirect cost rate requested was above the allowable rate. (23.66%)

He added Recommendation #5.

Mr. Matush asked for a clarification from the proponent. On page 1 the Executive Summary states the treatment area at 200 acres. But they will manually thin 38 acres and then 20 acres of sagebrush and then salvaging wood on 73 acres. They will mechanically treat 80 acres of sagebrush and thin 20 acres of Piñon and Juniper. And totaling those, it doesn't add up to 200 acres. He asked that to be addressed.

Ms. Suzanne Gifford, Business Manager for the Pueblo of Jemez responded. She said the treatment area in Jack Rabbit Flats has a total of 80 acres and 38 of that are to be thinned. IN Year one and year three, the treatments in Hondo Canyon - the salvaging is in Yea r three and is a larger area than the treatment in Year one. The total area for year 3 is 73 acres which includes the 38 acres that are included in year 1. So it is 80 plus 73 is approximately 153 acres total. So the 200 acres may be a typo.

Mr. Dunn said the question now is did that clarification affect the first weakness?

Mr. Barrone didn't think so.

Mr. Jervis felt it was Weakness #18.

Mr. Berrens said the value for public funding was low - the $40,000 in allowable costs. It should be listed as a weakness. There is $39,363 of unallowable costs on this project. They used both the indirect cost rate and the match. That is in the 10% allowable indirect cost rate. They probably should have taken the difference and put it into the federal request.

The Facilitator noted it was included under Weaknesses and also as an Administrative Observation. She asked if the panel wanted to leave them in both places.

Mr. Racher agreed it was both.

Mr. Payne suggested they could switch the match.

Mr. Gomez asked for a calculator.

Ali said that 10% is allowable.

Mr. Berrens thought if they have an approved indirect rate, they can put it in as matching.

Mr. Gomez said the project is under matched.

Mr. Gomez added Weakness #4 - *Commitment letters are missing from LANL, USDA Resource Conservation Service, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Bureau of Reclamation, EPA, Riverside Charter School and Jemez Day School.*

He added a second Weakness - *The acres mentioned vary. The Governor's letter said it would be on 150 acres. The Executive Summary says 200 acres. The Maps total 227 acres. And the letter to the tribe states 150 acres.*

Mr. Jervis added Strengths #19, 22, 26 and 32.

He added Weaknesses #13, 18 and 25. (25 are in administrative).

Mr. Jervis added Recommendation #16 and a new Recommendation - *The proposal would be strengthened if the proponents included an assessment of grazing management alternatives, impacts and proposed changes.* He wasn't sure that was right.

Mr. Gomez made a typo correction on 18.

Mr. Olivas said on the budget it said there was a monitoring and education coordinator but they had no budget in year one for it.

Ms. Gifford said she would be monitoring the funds herself. The budget would come from another federal source.

Mr. Bird wanted to take a weakness (W-30) and turn it into a strength - It was refreshing that this included a reference for PJ Restorations. So, although weak, it was in there. There was a reference to the Romney paper.

Mr. Racher commented on Weakness #13 regarding the amount of collaboration. They were not putting a lot of people on the ground but the fire was significant to restoration efforts. As I watched the Southwest Jemez CFLRP coming in, I was watching the Pueblo's capacity to keep significant monitoring. So I'm asking that W-13 be taken out.

Mr. Jervis accepted that - delete W-13.

The Facilitator reviewed the Strengths, Weaknesses, Recommendations and Administrative Observations for this proposal.

She asked the panelists to complete their scoring sheets.

Break- 2:15 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.

Public Comment Period

Before the break, Mr. Dunn said we will share all the strengths and weaknesses and decide if they were consistent in the proposals. We will search for evidence of letters.

Ms. Burnett said "and possibly NEPA existing documents."

Mr. Dunn agreed. If the NEPA is in process, it could say when it was expected to be completed.

Review Applications For Consistency

When the Panel reconvened at 3:15, the Facilitator announced there were 3 pieces to get done. 1 - look at public comments and how we would deal with them. 2 - consistency of Strengths and Weaknesses among the proposals with Administrative Observations and then 3 - looking at the overall review. Then they would look at the overall scores on Friday.

Mr. Dunn said for the administrative observations, we need to make sure those appear at the right place.

The Facilitator mentioned that the public comments from yesterday were not here now but would be tomorrow morning.

Mr. Dunn said we will deal with the ones we have today but will wait for tomorrow for the rest of them. The other thing we need to do in consistency is to flag those applications that we have decided are ineligible because they did not include something required by the RFA.

Ms. Burnett thought some of the public comments addressed administrative observations. How important is it for us to address those?

Mr. Dunn said it was not important at all except the stuff related to federal regulations of federal grants.

Ali explained that they are negotiated but there is nothing for the Panel to do with them.

Mr. Dunn added that the staff went through these applications last Friday and didn't feel there was anything in this group of applications that couldn't be fixed in negotiation. The Panel's job is the prioritized list of proposals from best to least that match the purposes and objectives of the Act.

Mr. Racher said thanks for going through that and not requiring it of the panel.

Mr. Dunn commented that in past years too much time was spent arguing over federal regulations.

Mr. Olivas asked if in adjusting the strengths and weaknesses the panel is not going to change scores.

Mr. Dunn said no - consistency and strengths and weaknesses and then recommendations. If there was something that he had not seen happen. But maybe you discovered in the consistency review something suddenly made the panel want to look at the scores but that has never happened before. The core thing is, when people are upset with the process that often devours much of our time, are inconsistencies in the wording of strengths and weaknesses. Applicants complain about what they think was inconsistent compared with how the panel treated another applicant so it was unfair.

The applicants are very active listeners and observers of how fair and consistent the process is. And they are very good at pointing out anything that isn't consistent and should therefore be reconsidered. The degree to which it is consistent adds to the integrity of the whole process and means a better process.

Mr. Barrone noted we were saying the applicants that didn't submit the tribal letters were ineligible. What about those who didn't supply their NEPA letters?

Mr. Dunn said if those were implementation projects and a NEPA decision existed at the time of their submittal, and then based on the RFA, they would to be disqualified. From his point of view, if it is a utilization project and they are not proposing to do it under their grant then it would be different.

Mr. Bird asked if the NEPA decision was not made when it was submitted, whether it should have something in the application addressing that issue.

Mr. Dunn agreed.

Mr. Dunn read from the RFA on what must be included. The other piece in the RFA regarding a letter of endorsement was to describe when it would be completed if it was not complete then. So for implementation projects it had to have one or the other. If they have neither, we have no choice but to declare the proposal ineligible.

Mr. Payne agreed it must be as described in the RFA.

Ms. Burnett said if the proposal was a utilization project that leverages an implementation project the NEPA needs to be complete.

Mr. Dunn agreed.

Public Comments Review

Mr. Dunn suggested they start with the utilization proposals and go by the grant number.

Mr. Dunn read what it said in RFA about this part of the process. From the bylaws he read that the public may attend any part or all of the meeting and submit written comments. The panel will not consider new information that was required by the RFA if it constitutes new changes to the proposal.

Mr. Gomez asked if they should wait on public comments if they are going to take off a weakness. With substantial evidence that we need to take off, could that change the scores?

Mr. Dunn suggested the members go through to see if the comment would make a big difference and tag it for review tomorrow. If the panel decided it wanted to re-score that proposal, you wouldn’t get back your old scores. We would give out a new score sheet. We don’t have the scores recorded by panelist name.

Mr. Payne said the Panel might want to consider a criterion that you felt might need to be changed.

Mr. Dunn reiterated, “So make a note - tag it - and tomorrow you could say you felt that criterion needed to be adjusted.

Ms. Burnett said what she heard was looking at a very narrow window. As a group we would say it could affect our score on criterion 3 and could get the score for that criterion and we wouldn’t see all criteria scores.

Ali asked why the Panel would even need to see a score. You could re-score it but you wouldn’t need to know what the average score from before.

Mr. Bird asked if at some point we would have the scores and rankings up there.

Mr. Dunn agreed. At some point you would have to see them tomorrow. The principal outcome from this effort is a recommendation on which proposals best meet the purpose in a prioritized list for each category of applications. The more you can separate out which criterion you want to re-score, the better. The evaluation and consistency check is to make sure you treated everyone the same and after doing that, then you see what the scores are.

Rating each proposal by itself, based on the criteria and concluding you evaluated each one fairly and equally - that's really important. And then you score it as you score it. If you go in and change all of that, it decreases the value of the work. And it becomes much more difficult for me if you start doing it that way.

Mr. Dunn said not having a letter from one of the sources for match would be a weakness. If there was a letter but it didn't give everything that was needed, he didn't think it would exclude the application the way not having a letter would.

Ms. Burnett asked if the panel was allowed to have weaknesses that are not tied to the RFA. Mr. Dunn agreed.

Mr. Dunn clarified that people could not submit something that was required in the RFA (and should have been included in the application) during the public comment period and have the panel remove that weakness because they did that. The by-laws make that clear. But the public could submit additional information to clarify something that was a point of discussion. Mr. Payne gave an example.

Public Comments Received Today -

The Facilitator read comments received today.

02-11

The first one was regarding 02-11 from Anthony Madrid - Santa Fé Firewood and Landscaping. He gave his encouragement to the panel. There was nothing specific on strengths and weaknesses but support for the project because it would help the district significantly. It was a fairness issue. It was the second project considered.

Mr. Dunn didn't think it affected anything.

The Facilitator reaffirmed that it would not affect any of the strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Jervis said they already had a strength on that issue.

The panel took it under advisement.

Mr. Racher didn't feel they needed to address anything on it. There was consensus.

Ms. Fisher asked if on Weakness #33 the panel was treating utilization differently than implementation. The Panel agreed and tagged it to look at it tomorrow.

Mr. Racher said we picked up in later projects that we recognized they had value in reasonable costs because they were not asking for salaries. This is one where we did not pick up on that.
He said it was picked up in 09-11 and Mr. Payne copied the statement from 09 to 02.

Mr. Payne suggested that they check the percentages of federal funds shown to make sure it was correct.

Mr. Payne asked if they were only requesting a portion of the salary.

Mr. Racher agreed. He said in 02-11, they are requesting only a portion of the salaries. This project leverages funding to accomplish goals beyond the CFRP funding available. So it was some of the personnel costs.

Ms. Burnett said this was the one where my comment was about the salaries not matching. We had another one about making sure there was no conflict on Shawn Knox.

Mr. Gomez recommended that the computer show a different color for the changes for tomorrow's review or use italic type. Mr. Payne put it in red.

Mr. Dunn said they did not have a color printer.

Mr. Gomez said he meant just on the screen - track changes or italic font or something because they would not know what had been changed that might change the score... He pointed out that Arturo was not present and would not know what changes had occurred but he would be present tomorrow.

Ms. Burnett didn't see how he could do that.

Mr. Payne said he would put it in red and then the panel could choose to use it or not.

Mr. Barrone asked if on 09-11 that there was no match and it was proponent's money.

Mr. Racher agreed. It was a strength. This was something that needed to value the criteria.

The Facilitator went back to review public comments on 09-11.

Mr. Dunn said there was a suggestion that they go back and just do each one in order and deal with the public comments as they came up.

The panel agreed to do it that way.

Mr. Dunn said the only caveat was that there were some proposals you are missing public comment on and didn't remember what numbers they were. We couldn't flag them because we don't know what proposal numbers those public comments had addressed (the ones the other recorder had).

So let's just start at the beginning and go all the way through and if we find out tomorrow that there were comments we did not have we can make sure we capture that.

Ali said she knew there were some more comments coming in for tomorrow. They could also acknowledge the ones that the panel identified as ineligible.

Mr. Dunn clarified that they would start at 01-11 and go through them as far as they went today and when the panel got to one where there was public comment, we would address it. Then tomorrow, the panel would start where they left off and then will know what the other comment is and might have to backtrack a little for that.

01-11

01-11 was declared ineligible because there was no NEPA included.

Mr. Dunn cautioned that it was a utilization proposal and they were in a grey area because the implementation on the ground is not what they were asking from FS.

Ms. Burnett said this one was not implementation on the ground so it was ineligible. Mr. Dunn agreed.

There were no public comments.

02-11

02-11 was just done. They cleaned up some of the language on it from 09-11.

There was public comment and it was more of a fairness issue.

Under Administrative Observations they wanted to assure that the hiring of Shawn Knox and RME LLC as consultant did not conflict with the New Mexico Code of Conduct.

1. The proposal and budget did not address the purposes.

03-11

Ms. Burnett said although this was utilization, they needed to document that it is BLM property. They would be taking wood and making it charcoal. They referenced NEPA but don't include it.

Mr. Bird said it is on tribal lands.

Mr. Dunn reread the RFA direction - The proposals for which NEPA compliance has been completed must include a copy of the NEPA decision document in an appendix. Then they must indicate land management officials cooperating in the development of the proposed project will support the project and the letter must indicate the proposed treatment area has the required NEPA documentation completed or describe when it will be completed as part of the project.

Mr. Racher concluded the NEPA document is not included.

Ms. Burnett said that is listed as a weakness.

Mr. Dunn indicated a couple of key words - the letter of endorsement for the proposed treatment area - meaning it is an application that includes treatment - the letter has to describe that NEPA is either complete or it is in such and such a state of completeness.

Mr. Pohlman said the BIA letter confirmed that NEPA is complete.

Mr. Dunn read from bylaws page 11, 3rd bullet down from the top, which follows what began on page 10 regarding the letter of endorsement. "The letter must also indicate that the proposed treatment (which he interpreted to say if there was treatment proposed with federal funding) that the proposed treatment area has the required NEPA documentation completed or describe when the documentation will be completed or how the NEPA work will be completed as part of the project as described in the project work plan and budget."

The other place where direction on this subject appears is page 15, Item E toward the bottom of the page - "Proposals for which NEPA compliance has been completed must include a copy of the NEPA decision document as an appendix."

So he repeated that for utilization projects - the reason he believed utilization was in a different category from implementation was because of the words "proposed treatment" which to him implied that the treatment being proposed was part of the project funding.

Mr. Jervis pointed out that in this case the treatment is not being funded by federal funds.

Mr. Dunn suggested that means that they did not have to have the document. That's how he would interpret it. The panel might feel otherwise.

Mr. Gomez read that as agency writer stated that the NEPA has been completed, that should suffice.

Ms. Burnett said what Mr. Dunn read first was the requirement and in addition to the requirement the panel discussed the monitoring a lot. Thinning was an integral part of the proposal but not being paid out of federal funds.

Mr. Jervis said what Ms. Fisher wanted to bring up is Weakness #6. And if it is correct, then whether they have NEPA or not is irrelevant.

Mr. Gomez agreed.

Mr. Dunn said Tribes are just encouraged.

Mr. Berrens concluded that it depends on what you mean by treatment. If you interpret treatment to mean thinning and biomass removal, then it appears that thinning is a separate grant and biomass removal and monitoring is covered under this grant they wouldn't have to have NEPA documented. But it treatment means that they are going to take it from the ground and then haul it away then they have to have the NEPA documented.

The Facilitator asked if this was impact the score.

Mr. Berrens said his interpretation was based on the notion of treatment and biomass removal.

The Facilitation noted that most of the panel decided they were ineligible. She asked if anyone disagreed with that.

Mr. Matush disagreed that treatment meant the utilization because utilization could be [lock and scatter?] or it could be piling and burning. Treatment to him meant you either paint on the herbicide on or cut it down and then you have to do something with the biomass. And that's utilization. You either burn it or haul it off.

Mr. Jervis said if it is done on the ground it requires NEPA. He didn't think you could combine both of them for treatment.

Mr. Payne responded to Mr. Pohlman that NEPA for just thinning and dropping to the ground would not allow utilization so NEPA would not only have to say thinning or cutting but would have to say removal would. So that is an integral part of the operation and that would need to be covered in the NEPA document. Mr. Matush agreed it was an integral part.

Mr. Gomez said the NEPA is complete but the tribe didn't include it so that is a weakness.

The consensus was that it was ineligible [for lack of including NEPA certification.]

04-11

There were comments from Roger Tucker that were not available now so this one was reserved for tomorrow morning.

05-11

This is a utilization proposal and has no public comment.

Mr. Olivas said they needed to move W 33 down to be a recommendation.

Mr. Dunn favored making it an Administrative Observation for consistency.

It was moved to Administrative Observations.

They went back to check that in 02-11 and also found it on 03-11 as Administrative Observations.

They went back to 05-11

Ms. Burnett said on this one they accidently put in the FONSI. Their project is covered by an administrative policy and they submitted the same FONSI.

Mr. Payne explained that they submitted two copies of one part of NEPA and left out the Decision Document from one of the project areas that included treatment.

The Facilitator read that they failed to submit it or the Bosque Wildfire Project. It would have been helpful to have the treatment area... They put two copies for one area and none for the other.

Mr. Gomez said that would make them ineligible.

The panel moved it to ineligible.

The panel worked on the language to use but several people were talking at once.

Ms. Burnett said for 66 they attached the supplemental EA.

Mr. Bird asked if those two decisions cover all the treatment area.

Ms. Burnett said we don't know because we don't have the cover pages.

Mr. Jervis said they provided the cover letter and decision page but not the FONSI.

Mr. Bird asked if the FONSI is not a decision document.

Mr. Gomez thought it was the same as a decision document.

Ms. Burnett thought they did attempt to provide it. It is not clear cut.

Mr. Dunn suggested not throwing out unclear items.

The Facilitator said it is entered into the weakness area.

Mr. Dunn clarified that isn't the same thing as ineligible.

Mr. Bird asked if we are not sure that all of the decision documents cover all the treatment areas.

Mr. Jervis included it as a weakness - not ineligibility. It may not be clear but it could be covered.

No ineligibility was attached to this proposal.

The Facilitator noted no changes in scores at this point.

07-11

Mr. Jervis said the program income now in Recommendations has to go to Administrative Observations.

It was moved to Administrative Observations.

There were no public comments to consider on this proposal.

08-11

There were no public comments to consider on this proposal.

The panel made not changes to this proposal.

09-11

There was public comment related to letters of support from Old Wood.

Total charges billable to Old Wood LLC will be $1,500 in year 1 and $3,500 in year 2 for a total of $5,000.

Mr. Racher noted this is new information so the panel should let that weakness stand because the letter came in afterward.

The Facilitator said there is also a letter of support from the Irland Group.

The panel agreed it could not change the weakness as it was submitted late.

Mr. Payne moved the program income item to Administrative Observations from Recommendations.

10-11

There were no public comments for this proposal.

Mr. Bird noted this one does have Rocky Mountain Ecology.

Ms. Burnett said they needed to add that conflict of interest language from 02-11.

11-11

There was no public comment on this proposal.

12-11

This was first flagged for consideration tomorrow but the letter thought to be on this one was actually for 04-11.

There was no public comment on this proposal.

13-11

Mr. Gomez excused himself for his appointment at 4:30 p.m.

14-11

There were no public comments for this proposal.

15-11

There were no public comments for this proposal.

16-11

This proposal was flagged for consideration tomorrow.

17-11

This is an implementation proposal.

Mr. Jervis said contractor letters didn't match the proposal but the letter was there.

The panel moved the recommendation on program income included to Administrative Observations.

Mr. Jervis noted the multiparty monitoring was added to Recommendations.

Ms. Burnett said this proposal needs to have the Shawn Knox conflict of interest recommendation added.

18-11

Ms. Burnett thought this one needed the Shawn Knox recommendation but then realized it didn't.

There were no public comments for this proposal.

19-11

Mr. Berrens noted a weakness related to mismatch between NEPA and a public comment on 16 -11. He asked if they should do this one tomorrow to make sure that weakness was treated the same in both proposals.

The panel flagged it for a revisit tomorrow.

20-11

Mr. Cooke said there was a letter on this one.

Mr. Bird thought there was a public comment on this one.

Ali said it was a letter from the District Ranger. It was concerning 02-11, 14-11 and 20-11.

Mr. Cooke said it was implementation. The proposal said the NEPA is complete. We need to go back and make sure the line officer statement and the document is in the packet.

Ms. Burnett said it is in there.

The panel flagged 20-11 for review tomorrow.

21-11

Mr. Jervis noted that not all letters from partners were included.

The Facilitator said there was also a weakness on this before.

Mr. Jervis said the Recommendation on program income needs to move to Administrative Observations.

Mr. Jervis said the Forest Hill letter is particularly important to have in there but there is no letter in the proposal. He asked if that would make it ineligible.

Ms. Burnett thought they were adding more things to the ineligible list. Tribes and NEPA were what the panel agreed on.

Mr. Cooke thought a late letter was also included as making it ineligible.

Mr. Dunn read from the RFA, page 15, C ii - Appendices must include the following: letters of commitment from non-federal sources supporting cash or values of in-kind services as described in the budget; letters of support from partners describing how they have or will participate in the project and/or how the project will benefit the community.

Ms. Burnett thought support letters were just nice things to have but commitment to things in the budget were essential to include.

Mr. Dunn clarified that what the GNA people told him was if it shows a non-federal match in the budget you do have to have a letter from them agreeing to provide it - particularly for cash. He didn't know that it was quite as strict for project partners. The key thing is non-federal match that requires a letter. Project partner letters are fuzzy.

Mr. Racher understood a letter must be included for non-federal match.

Mr. Jervis said here it is not related to either of those three letters that are missing. So we should leave it as a weakness.

Mr. Bird disagreed.

Ms. Burnett thought they may have worded the weakness incorrectly. They needed to check the budget on it. This could come back to be an issue.

The Panel did not declare this proposal as ineligible.

22-11

There was no public comment for this proposal.

23-11

Mr. Chacón protested Weakness 17.

Mr. Racher said Weakness #6 should make it ineligible.

The Panel agreed this proposal was ineligible.

24-11

This proposal became ineligible for the same reason as 23-11.

06-11 (Out of order)

Mr. Jervis said Weakness #13 needs to go into Administrative Observations.

Review of Agenda for Friday, Day 5

The Panel stopped here at 4:55 p.m. The agenda tomorrow would begin with the review of 4-11, 9-11, 16-11, and then 25-11.

The panel would reconvene at 8:30 AM.

The Facilitator thought they should be finished around 12:00 noon.

April 29, 2011

Review Agenda for the Day

Final Review & Rescoring

Mr. Dunn mentioned that to be consistent, we will have to follow the guidelines at the top of page 4 of the RFA. It says, “applications that do not meet the CFRP eligibility requirements in Section 3 and do not follow the format in Section of 4 of this Request will be removed from consideration and not be reviewed by the panel. The FS should have caught some things but failed to do so and that’s our problem.

Given that and our discussion yesterday, if you go to page 15 of the RFA where we spent a bunch of time yesterday, these letters of support I, ii, iii, iv - we can’t be picking and choosing in there because when we have scores that are very close to one another and one gets eliminated because they have not met I and another one didn’t meet ii for letters of support from private partners, we will be on a slippery slope. So what I’m saying is that if any of these things are clearly not included then I think they are going to have to be removed from consideration to be consistent.

Maybe there is a letter of support from a partner that doesn’t give us absolutely everything but sounds clear - for consistency’s sake I think we are going to have to do that or else people who don’t end up in the top ranking will bring that to my attention. Also for the tribal letters.

That is what we have to do. Otherwise, it will be difficult to defend the process.

Ms. Burnett noted that under D-2, second sentence, it said letters should not exceed one page in length.

Mr. Dunn clarified that it was a “should” and not a “shall.”

Ms. Fisher - the letters of commitment that are all cash I understand. If they have the letter but don’t specify a value, what do we do?

Mr. Dunn - if it is in-kind match we have no choice.

Ms. Fisher - if they have don’t have a letter in the proposal, are they dinged for that?

Mr. Dunn - not just dinged. The proposal is removed.

Mr. Payne - if you look at the one the panel talked about yesterday - if you look at that one, it says right in there if no letters are available, grants should include documentation of conversation with tribes. So in response to that, if there is no letter, then document the conversation with the tribe. It is a grey area but we should not remove them from consideration if they have that documentation.

Mr. Dunn agreed. Certainly, for example, when they put a lot of it in there, he thought that was okay. And if they had a letter from a tribe thanking them then it is safe to assume they sent a request to the tribes for the letters.

Mr. Payne thought they could not declare an application ineligible in this grey area.

Mr. Olivas - on formatting, in the RFA on page 9, section 4, first paragraph, it says page numbers must

appear in the upper left hand corner. He asked if not having it made the application ineligible.

Mr. Payne - there is some risk here.

Mr. Dunn - that does not affect how the project will be implemented. It is a pain to read proposals without page numbers but these other things potentially can affect the way the project is implemented and that is a more serious matter. And like the letters of support issue, particularly for non-federal match - that is part of FS Service Manual direction and federal regulations and circulars about grants on what they have to have.

Mr. Olivas - so if they have a table in there - those are the ones that must provide a letter of support.

Mr. Dunn - That makes sense to me. Otherwise, how do we know they didn't just put that name in there so that they could say they talked with all the stakeholders when they didn't?

It is just like the issue the panel resolved yesterday whether we can accept information at review that isn't in the application. How do we know they sent off letters to the tribes? We don't. When we get it in the application, it is there.

Mr. Olivas - There were a lot of comments about indirect cost that exceeded the allowable amount of ten percent there were some from 14% to 26%. Is that something we would use?

Mr. Dunn - For entities that are negotiating an indirect cost rate it is unusual. They cannot receive a grant award or even approved until that is fixed. There is a hard fix for that; the supervisor won't sign the grant award unless that is fixed. There was one yesterday that really did affect the funding of the project. The kicker is if it something that could affect the way the project goes forward and something the GNA people would be likely to catch in the technical review.

Mr. Olivas - On one of them the Workers' Comp was dropped to 1.78% and it still didn't meet the cap.

Mr. Dunn clarified that fringe benefits were different. In this environment of increased audits, the grants review people are much more alert and vigilant and know that better than we do.

Mr. Gomez - how do we handle the non-federal match that is less than 20%?

Mr. Payne - the match generally would be cleaned up at time of award and they will demonstrate meeting the match before the award is made.

Mr. Dunn - the grant review team is trained to catch those things on non-federal match and indirect cost but they won't look for letters of support. That is programmatic. If the match isn't there, then it is out. There are cases where the applicants can say they will make it up but they can't do that. It would automatically not be funded. What the panel needs to focus on are the larger programmatic issues.

Mr. Payne - if there is evidence that the project is slightly below and could easily meet it I would have no problem, but if there is evidence that they are significantly below, we should discuss that.

Mr. Jervis - There are no CPAs or attorneys here with training to read those details of indirect costs and other GNA stuff. Our time would be better spent dealing with the substance of the proposals. We need to move on. NEPA is either there or not.

Mr. Dunn agreed except the panel needed to follow these things. If the letter isn't provided by the people that need to provide the letter.

Ms. Burnett asked if they needed to go back and note that.

The Facilitator felt it wouldn't hurt to start over and there are new comments so we are starting over at 01-11. This is the consistency part. The first comment is 04-11. She went back to 01-11.

Mr. Archuleta asked if they created a list of what to look for.

The Facilitator said there were some that needed to be moved to Administrative Observations and some were missed that had public comments and didn't have them here. Yesterday we highlighted those in red so we could see it thanks to Mr. Gomez.

Public Comment Period

Ms. San Gil asked that all new public comments be read.

The Facilitator agreed to follow the agenda and read the new comments first and then discuss the proposals for consistency.

The new comment was on 16-11 - Aspen Forest Products:

"I wanted to address the Panel's recommended weaknesses on the Aspen Forest Products Proposal.

Weakness 9: Application does not include provision for preserving old and large trees.

Response: Aspen Forest products disagrees with the weakness. Aspen Forest Products states that on page 1, the executive summary states that 'all old growth timber will be preserved.' Page 5, Objective 4 of the proposal states, 'Silvicultural prescriptions recommend that healthy, disease-free trees in all diameter classes and large and old growth will be retained.' Page 6, on the prescriptive work plan states that 'this will ensure that old and large trees (old growth) are protected and preserved...'

As far as the discussion over white fir objectives that created the panel confusion could have been clarified by Aspen Forest Products. The proposal mentions that '...since white fir can grow to large sizes quickly, it may also be appropriate to remove some large diameter white fir.' Aspen Forest Products will not remove any old-growth timber at all and never stated it would in the entire proposal. The weakness states there will be removal of old-growth. Aspen Forest products repeatedly states throughout the body, its overall objective of not removing any old-growth. Aspen Forest Products feels strongly that this should not have been listed as a weakness. Furthermore, Aspen Forest Products never related 'large' diameter trees to any specific dimension or to old growth. The call for the removal of large White Fir came directly from the NEPA prescription."

Weakness15:

With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the

viability of the business application.

Response: “On other proposals, this same issue has come up. On other proposals, this has not been listed as a weakness but has been listed as a recommendation. There is not consistency with other proposals. This should not be listed as a weakness on proposal 16.”

Weakness 28:

RFP state that the project history needs to address other federal or private grants for related activities and what is the status of those projects and/or grants...

Response: “Aspen Forest Products did not include an update on the Borrego Mesa Project because it considered the two projects were not related and were separate projects, on two completely different forests and managed by two separate ranger districts. Aspen Forest Products believed it answered the questions presented in the RFP. The Borrego Mesa CFRP is progressing and moving forward with its planned goals and objectives. It is an on-going project.”

The next new comment is for CFRP 33-11 - Los Amigos de Valles Caldera:

“Dear CFRP Panel Members:

“Thank you for the time and energy you have put into this process. Your efforts and recommendation are very much appreciated. Los Amigos de Valles Caldera appreciates this opportunity to address the weaknesses identified in our proposal:

#1 - Santa Clara’s letter of commitment shows $19,306 for services while the budget shows $28,750.

“The inconsistency in cost of services for the Santa Clara Pueblo’s fire crew between Santa Clara’s letter and our proposal budget is most unfortunate and likely the result of a misunderstanding regarding the length of a work day and subsequent calculation. We will trust Santa Clara’s listed costs to be correct, thereby reducing our funding request by $9,444.

#2 & #4: It is unclear how the byproduct will be extracted due to the size of some of the material that may not be able to be removed by hand. Application lacks a description or estimate of volume of restoration byproducts.

“We would like to emphasize that our project is an implementation project, not a utilization project. Because of challenging terrain, steep slopes and difficulty of access, extraction is indeed quite limited, as explained on page 6 or our proposal. Our wish to maintain the watershed integrity and generally roadless nature of the treatment site outweighed our desire to maximize extraction in this sensitive area. Additionally, larger thinned logs will be left on the ground as Jemez Mountains’ salamander habitat.

“That said, we do have 3 existing roads running through or adjacent to our project area: VC0301, VC0201 and VC02 (see Appendix A). As described, most downed material will be cut to four foot lengths and stacked into burn piles. However, Los Amigos volunteers, including certified sawyers, will be available to get as much material as reasonably possible to roadsides, where members of surrounding communities can collect it. Members of the public can easily obtain wood gathering permits from the Forest Service (the usual method for the VCNP to allow public collection of firewood on the Preserve), and will be able to collect wood left near the roads and, if they wish, from the burn piles

within the treatment area. The Valle Caldera Trust staff will also transport wood down to the VCT visitor staging area, to be utilized for events benefitting the public.

"Both access restrictions and habitat integrity concerns listed above make it difficult to estimate volume of material to be extracted. Moreover, as listed in our time line (Table 2, page 6), we will not know the exact extent of our thinning needs until we complete pre-treatment monitoring and tree marking in the fall of 2011. Marie Rodriguez, the Natural Resource Coordinator of the Valle Caldera, estimated that we could extract roughly 10 cords of wood to donate to the public, coming from areas within about 100 meters of the three roads in the project area; this represents a cumulative area of 25% of the project area. Please understand this is a rough estimate only and only by implementing our project will we be able to determine more exact quantities.

#3: Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with industry and commodity groups in design, implementation and monitoring.

"Budget limitations forced us to consider cost of services first and foremost to successfully complete the project. Therefore, we have planned to employ a mix of collaborating professional forest management personnel (Santa Clara Pueblo), inmate crews, and youth groups (Jemez Pueblo_. Our commodity from this implementation project is firewood, and the VCNP has implemented public firewood collection programs during thinning programs over the last couple of years; as such, the clientele for our commodity is already established. Finally, our project monitoring program is completely consistent with the current CFLRP monitoring program and equals or exceeds typical monitoring program standards conducted on other forest restoration projects."

The Facilitator had one more new comment on 34-11

"Dear CFRP Panel Members:

Please consider the attached letters from New Mexico Department of Game and Fish and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) in support of proposal 34-11, 'Implementation: Forest Thinning and Habitat Enhancement, Pueblo of Jemez.' from Suzanne Gifford, Natural Resources Business Manager, Pueblo of Jemez."

She next read the two attached letters. The first was from State of New Mexico Department of Game and Fish:

"Dear Mr. Kaufman:

"The New Mexico Department of Game and Fish supports the Pueblo of Jemez Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) proposal, 'Implementation: Forest Thinning and Habitat Enhancement, Pueblo of Jemez.' The proposed project will implement thinning of sagebrush, piñon-juniper and ponderosa pine woodlands in an effort to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire and improve habitat for key game species on two sensitive areas totaling over 150 acres within the Pueblo of Jemez tribal trust lands. Additionally, the project includes educational programs for primary and secondary students.

"We look forward to the continuance of our partnership with the Pueblo of Jemez in this collaborative effort to restore watershed health, vegetative diversity and wildlife habitat. The Department is committed to offering technical advice on treatment prescriptions for sagebrush and piñon-juniper

habitat restoration to maximize benefit to big game and other wildlife. Please feel free to contact me if I can provide additional information. Sincerely, James S. Lane, Jr., Wildlife Management Division Chief."

The second letter was from the NRCS dated April 12, 2011.

"Dear Mr. Kaufman: (This is the Natural Resources Department of the Pueblo of Jemez).

"I am writing in support of the Pueblo of Jemez application to the US Forest Service under the Collaborative Forest Restoration Project titled 'Implementation: Forest Thinning and Habitat Enhancement, Pueblo of Jemez.' The proposed project will implement thinning of sagebrush, piñon-juniper and ponderosa pine woodlands in an effort to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire and improve habitat for key big game species on two sensitive areas totaling over 150 acres within the Pueblo of Jemez tribal trust lands. Additionally, the project includes educational programs for primary and secondary students.

"NRCS will provide technical assistance to Pueblo of Jemez on this project. We have already met with Pueblo of Jemez Natural Resource Department staff to discuss vegetation treatment options to accomplish catastrophic fire threat reduction and wildlife habitat improvement goals. A site visit will be scheduled for this summer. We will be visiting the two field sites in order to assess current conditions and refine our treatment suggestions, including advice on sagebrush treatment, range improvement and grass seed selection.

"I encourage the CFRP panel to consider the Pueblo of Jemez proposal favorable in light of the urgent need for forest health improvement, fire threat reduction, wildlife habitat improvement and socio-economic growth. Please feel free to contact me if I can provide additional information. Sincerely, Jill Mumford, District Conservationist, Cuba Field Office."

David Cordova read an amendment to his comment:

"In my previous April 28, 2011 public comment I was unaware of one weakness listed on my proposal and I now would like to address and expand on my previous response. The one weakness was: The collaborator letters do not verify budget requests (Audubon and SIPI).

"My response was that Aspen Forest Products states that it completely followed the instructions in the 2011 Request for Applications. It appears that the Panel may be referring to page 15 in the appendices' requirements, paragraph C that deals with the in-kind contributions and the required match which states: 'Letters of commitment from non-federal sources supporting all cash or values of in-kind services described in the project budget and /or work plan.'

"Audubon New Mexico and the Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute are not committing to in-kind contributions or to be required 20% match. I do not understand why this weakness was given to my proposal. The FRA clearly does not support this weakness. The letters of commitment apply directly to in-kind services and match and not to collaborators listed in the budget. Both Audubon and SIPI are contractors/collaborators. There were no FRA requirements that contractor/collaborator letters had to mention the amount for their services. The only requirement within the RFA dealing with project partners is as follows: 'Letter of support from project partners describing how they had or will participate in the project and/or how the project will benefit the community...' Aspen Forest Products does not understand why this is a listed weakness and would like clarification.

"Expanding on my previous explanation of weakness 15 - With no estimates of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business application.
"I know this is a boilerplate weakness but again, Aspen Forest Products followed the RFA format. Can I get clarification from Mr. Dunn where RFA supports this weakness? Aspen Forest Products cannot find anywhere in the RFA that requests estimates of markets, values of products or production. We did though, list the production estimates as required in the first page of our application in the Executive Summary. There will be 285,000 board/feet of material and 890 cords of firewood from the Oho Pilot Unit and 40,000 board feet of material and 462 cords of firewood from the La Joya Unit.

"In conclusion, I am respectfully requesting that the Panel or Mr. Dunn show me the wording within the RFA that supports these weaknesses. I would also like to thank you for the diligent services and work you have provided as panel members. Sincerely, David Cordova, Aspen Forest Products."

Mr. Cordova made a brief comment on his written comment.

Review Applications for Consistency (continued)

01-11

The panel had no changes to 01-11.

02-11

The Facilitator had read the public comment on this proposal yesterday. In red appeared the language highlighted for consistency. Then on Administrative Observations was a boilerplate - "Assure that hiring Shawn Knox of Rocky Mountain Ecology, LLC as a consultant does not conflict with New Mexico State Code of Conduct."

Mr. Archuleta -The only other comment would be to make sure the total amount of time of Shawn Knox do not exceed 280 because this was a multiple application. You have to make sure the time is consistent.

Mr. Payne - I would say we don't put that in.

Mr. Archuleta - Then we should take it off of the other ones. It was the same applicant but two applications.

Mr. Dunn - It is in the Administrative Observations.

The Facilitator - So we are going to leave it off here but we will flag others who have contractors.

Mr. Dunn suggested maybe making an administrative note - like overall administrative observations.

Ms. San Gil - thought that one was right on the radar.

Mr. Dunn agreed.

Mr. Archuleta - It isn't an issue until after the funding.

Mr. Dunn agreed. The GNA people will also go through and make sure it doesn't exceed the number of hours.

Mr. Payne - didn't think we were going to monitor a partner's hours. He felt they didn't want to go there. If it was funded for more than full time - that was a different story.

Mr. Dunn - That's not what this says. I'm suggesting there be overall administrative comments on this kind of thing. After the Forest Service has the total grants that would be funded would make sure this person shares the code of conduct. That had to be done, no matter what. The panel is not here in the job of counting up all the hours. It is just a tag for the checklist. One page in a separate section of Administrative observations that applies to all of them - that affect multiple applications. We can add State Parks to that list.

03-11

This proposal was ineligible due to lack of NEPA Decision document not being included in the appendix.

Mr. Gomez thought they should take out Weakness #6. They are a tribe and they have a letter from the tribe.

Mr. Olivas favored keeping it there. It is ineligible anyway. It is not a deal breaker.

Mr. Gomez pointed out that there were other tribes that didn't do that so they should take it out just to be consistent or move the others to recommendations.

Ms. Burnett advocated moving it to a recommendation.

Mr. Gomez noted that Ohkay Owingeh didn't have it either.

Ms. Watson said they are encouraged but not required.

Mr. Dunn said since they were encouraged, the panel could have it as a weakness but could not disqualify them for not having one.

Mr. Payne moved it to recommendation. The application would be strengthened [this was one the screen but not stated]. NEPA is there but not in the application.

Mr. Dunn asked if they could add to the evaluation scoring - NEPA documentation, just to be a little more specific. He was very sensitive to be clear on why the panel was knocking them out. He wanted to be as specific as possible. He was worried about the evaluation score.

The Facilitator said it would change the evaluation score.

Mr. Dunn agreed. It should say, *Ineligible due to the lack of NEPA's decision document in the appendix of the proposal.*

Mr. Payne confirmed they said it was complete but they didn't include it.

Mr. Gomez read from page 15 of the RFA that tribal applicants were encouraged to seek letters from other affected tribes. If they have a letter from another tribe, doesn't that meet the RFA?

Mr. Archuleta thought it did.

The Facilitator said it was not from a neighboring tribe. She asked if it should be taken out.

Mr. Racher said they do have a letter but not from other neighboring tribes.

Mr. Gomez said they are encouraged to seek letters from other tribes. If Taos Pueblo didn't send a letter, it is not their fault. It looks like they did try to contact the neighboring tribes.

The panel agreed to take that recommendation out.

04-11

Ms. San Gil explained that this letter (from NWTF - Scott P. Lerich, to Robert Tucker) was submitted to our office and was our fault it didn't get copied for the panel. The FS staff found it in the box with the original applications.

The Facilitator said it is dated February 24th. She asked what the panel wanted to do with the new information.

Mr. Racher said they needed letters of support from all partners.

Mr. Jervis said the panel should take it off then.

Mr. Gomez - said the panel needed determine if this was an element that would change the scoring of the 13 criteria. A note that would highlight it should be made.

Mr. Dunn suggested using strike through instead of deleting it.

The panel agreed.

Mr. Barrone wanted to make sure on the Carson - the NEPA process was Weakness #9. He didn't know how that would affect them. It was in reference to preserving old trees. That was one of the criteria. We found it as a weakness and one of the criteria. It is in the NEPA document that regarding large trees that they could cut them.

Ms. Fisher agreed they might have scored it differently. It could change.

Mr. Barrone pointed out that it is true for any of the Carson projects. They should review all Carson projects on that point.

The statement on need to reflect program income in the budget was added to the recommendations for 04-11.

05-11

No comments were submitted on 05-11.

Ms. Burnett - referred to the paragraph on page 4, section 4 that includes requirements for a multi-party monitoring plan. We have a weakness that the monitoring plan is vague. She quoted from the RFA statement that the monitoring plan must include for those that add vegetation ... The proposal did not address the requirement.

Mr. Archuleta thought it would then be ineligible.

Mr. Olivas recalled this is the one that had no page numbers.

Mr. Jervis was uncomfortable in ruling it ineligible. It probably wouldn't rate high anyway.

Mr. Archuleta said he could argue that it is ineligible.

Mr. Jervis agreed. It would be ineligible because it did not include the core ecological indicator required in the RFA.

Ms. Burnett explained to Mr. Dunn that it was in the RFA as a must. She wasn't saying it should be ineligible but didn't know how to treat that.

Mr. Matush felt that was too nit picky.

Mr. Dunn pointed out that would it significantly affect the way the project was implemented.

Mr. Archuleta said that could be said of a NEPA document not being there. The NEPA was completed.

Mr. Matush thought the panel should be looking at the value of these projects.

Mr. Bird suggested keeping all of them then.

Mr. Matush felt this was not a major thing.

Mr. Dunn asked why they decided in the past why the NEPA decision must be included. Panel members, particularly scientists, said it was not giving all the information needed. That information was in the NEPA document. So it was not just a bureaucratic thing.

Mr. Archuleta said we look at it and ask if this project did something.

Mr. Matush said it had cottonwoods being planted. It is an oversight but an oversight is not a deal breaker. If the NEPA was complete it is not a deal breaker. The NEPA is an important document. Sometimes the core indicator makes it unsustainable.

Mr. Berrans said this is a sticky wicket. He suggested as an alternative that the RFA technically requires that the FS screen ineligibles before they get to the panel. And now we are caught in looking at

the fine print which is not his duty so he was going to stay out of it. In his professional judgment he would suggest the panel not make any rulings on ineligibility. The FS can make that decision but he didn't think the panel should

Mr. Bird agreed.

The panel agreed to not declare any applications ineligible but let the FS do that.

Mr. Dunn was okay with that.

The Facilitator said they would take the ineligible designation off of 03-11.

Mr. Gomez proposed they do strike out instead of removing because it is a public record. (Ms. San Gil did that).

Mr. Dunn clarified that it wouldn't become a public document until he had reviewed and approved it.

Mr. Archuleta said if the lack of that letter affected scores it should be re-evaluated.

The Facilitator agreed to flag 04-11 and they would come back to it when looking at the scored.

05-11

Mr. Berrens had a comment on 05-11. He pointed out they had no estimate on the value of the products. He asked if it was a weakness or a recommendation.

Mr. Jervis - said that was different from project costs and should stay as a weakness. The weakness of not having estimates of value was a business thing. It reflected whether your assessment is that this could be successful. Whether the costs are appropriately allocated is an administrative issue.

The panel was okay with leaving that one.

16-11

This proposal had a new public comment.

Mr. Jervis recalled this was the one in which the concern was with the old growth.

Mr. Archuleta said it was Weakness #9. We had a discussion about a provision in the grant that we could not count against them on the preservation of large trees. He advocated removing that weakness.

The Panel agreed to remove it.

Mr. Barrone said 08-11 had the same thing.

Ms. Fisher recused herself from the discussion on 08-11 because of a conflict of interest.

Mr. Dunn said in the past, for this part of the discussion, those with conflicts had stayed in the room but

were not allowed to participate in the discussion. But for the record, he asked that those with conflicts physically leave the room.

Ms. Fisher left the room for this discussion.

Mr. Racher said the panel discussed the weakness at that time and the weakness was accurate as stated.

Mr. Jervis thought they could say the application was unclear about the protection of old wood because of the statement on page six where they said they would remove old white fir.

Mr. Racher felt the change to unclear solved the problem.

Ms. Burnett pointed out that it said the white fir was of large diameter but not necessarily old growth.

Mr. Bird thought that intent was okay but it still was unclear.

Mr. Berrens said it says on page one that old growth will be preserved. Page 5 says old and large will be retained. But on page 6 he says some large diameter White Fir would not be preserved. He had a problem with calling it a weakness.

Mr. Dunn said he would not be able to defend it as a weakness.

The panel moved the statement from weakness to recommendation and edited as a recommendation to say, *the proposal should be clarified with respect to protection of larger diameter white fir*.

Mr. Bird was okay with that.

Ms. Burnett suggested they needed to make sure that in future proposals that the NEPA language and the proposal language were clear. They should either remove this language in other proposals. It has to be consistent - how the language in the proposal relates to NEPA.

Mr. Bird asked if Weakness #15 should be a recommendation.

Ms. San Gil said it was included as a weakness in previous reviews.

Mr. Bird was okay with leaving it.

Mr. Archuleta referred to Weakness #28 and wondered if the RFA requirements might make it ineligible because it was shown under two different ranger districts. They also had something under Administrative Observations that GNA would have to make sure that review information didn't overlap. He wasn't sure if it should be a weakness or just administrative observation. He also asked while that was being looked up if they could go back to a public comment made on 18.

Mr. Dunn explained that if they are contractors then there is a procurement process that GNA people will require - (3 different bids, etc). So the letter would not be required to say it is the value of these things. But subgrantees must provide a statement of value. His point was that if listed as a contractor, they shouldn't have to provide a budget breakdown.

He explained that if FS was giving somebody a grant, then to determine if they are capable of

administering this grant, they would want to see how they managed any previous grants.

There was another element - you could have two CFRP grants simultaneously. And they were independent of one another. How did they do the last time they had a grant?

Mr. Archuleta agreed they should say that with respect to Criterion 10- on Weakness #28.

Ms. Burnett pointed out that a weakness is not necessarily something that violates the RFA. In regard to federal match, she thought they needed to acknowledge in their letter that they agreed with the costs listed in the budget. That affects their ability to complete the project so Weakness #15 should stay in.

The panel agreed.

Mr. Dunn asked that the comment under Weakness #28 regarding budget with Audubon and SIPI be moved to be a Recommendation because they didn't use the language "subgrantee" in the RFA.

Ms. Burnett said if they receive federal funds, it should include their acceptance of the budgeted amount.

Mr. Jervis felt that should remain as a weakness. He said it would not change his score.

The panel agreed to have #15 left as a weakness.

With regard to Weakness # 28, Mr. Dunn read from the RFA that required grantees who had received a previous grant to show the relationship of that grant with the present project.

Ms. Fisher returned to the panel.

19-11

Ms. Burnett noted their concern here was with Recommendation #9. - Application should address the inconsistency.

Ms. Fisher thought that would affect the scoring.

The Facilitator flagged it.

Mr. Gomez said part of the process the panel agreed on yesterday was to go back to re-score those.

The Facilitator agreed.

Ms. Burnett suggested flagging 16-11.

The Facilitator had it flagged.

Mr. Racher recalled that yesterday we flagged 02-11.
The Facilitator agreed that 2, 4, 16 and 19 were all flagged so far.

20-11

Ms. Burnett thought there was a comment letter on this one. It was a district letter.

The Facilitator found a letter from Anthony Madrid supporting the project and read it:

"To the CFRP Technical Advisory Panel. My name is Anthony Madrid. I am the new District Ranger on the Canjilon Ranger District of the Carson National Forest. I did not have an opportunity to provide input on Proposal 20-11 but I have reviewed the proposal and met with the applicant several times. I support the project and would like to add a couple of comments.

1. The project site is not in within a heavily forested area but rather in the sagebrush country. Please do not discount this project because it is in the sage brush. Sagebrush areas are extremely important to the Carson. Almost 10% of our land mass is sagebrush country. These areas provide significant forage and habitat for wildlife and domestic stock, especially wintering wildlife. This project is an excellent watershed restoration project with multiple improvements (brush hogging, seeding, water development and road decommissioning).

2. Also, I do not want you folks to minimize the potential for wild fire in the sagebrush community. The Carson has multiple fires within the sagebrush country every year. By treating the sagebrush, this project will reduce the potential for wild fire and in case of a fire, it will reduce intensity and flame lengths. This project site is surrounded by heavily forested PJ. In case of a fire, this area could serve as a fire break or safety zone.

The Canjilon RD fully supports this project. Anthony Madrid, Canjilon District Ranger.

There were no comments from the panel on this public comment.

22-11

No comments were made on 22-11.

23-11

Mr. Bird had a conflict on 23-11 and left the room.

Mr. Jervis noted they had it listed as ineligible and they should take that out.

The panel agreed to strike through the ineligibility statement on 23-11.

There was a public comment from Mr. Chacón that the Facilitator had already read. She said he had received Weakness #17 that volume of byproducts was unclear. He stated that budget pages 4, 8 and 10 indicated the volume of restoration byproducts under #8 - Other. Please consider removing that weakness from the proposal review based on this information...

Mr. Racher favored leaving it in there.

The panel agreed to move on with it in there.

Ms. Fisher asked if the panel need to re-score #5. She noted they were going to go back to it.

The Facilitator said they would use her flagging list.

Mr. Bird returned to the panel.

24-11

The Panel removed the ineligible statement.

There were no public comments on 24-11.

Ms. Burnett noted for consistency that both 23 and 24 had letters submitted during public comment. She asked to delete on Weakness #6 the word "however."

Mr. Racher asked if someone was making notations for FS to look at eligibility.

Ms. San Gil said it was duly noted.

The Panel flagged 24-11 as needing to be re-scored.

06-11

This one was done earlier.

25-11
There were no public comments on 25-11.

Mr. Jervis reminded the panel they had to move the last recommendation (regarding program income) to Administrative Observations.

27-11

Mr. Matush recused himself for this discussion and left the room.

Public comments were received for 27-11.

The Facilitator said the one on the FS 424 was an Administrative Observation.

Mr. Archuleta said that sounded like there was some issue. He asked if she could have the coordinator state what it was.

Mr. Koury said there were some comments on weaknesses.

The Facilitator said Weakness #16 related to safety of operators. The comment said YCC crews and Town of Silver City will do employee who have received safety training work. Snedaker Enterprises who will be removing trees and doing the chipping is a license and bonded company.

She asked the panel if Weakness 16 should be taken out.

Mr. Archuleta said it is a contractor so that is not needed.

The Panel did not agree to remove that weakness.

Mr. Pohlman asked for it to be read again. The Facilitator did so.

The panel left it as a weakness and agreed it would not affect the scoring.

The Facilitator read the comment on Weakness #18 - On page 2 under partner's paragraph it is stated that we would consult with New Mexico Environmental Department to develop erosion control plan and restoration treatment to insure erosion on site is minimized. This is stated as our first objective on page 3, last paragraph.

The panel left the weakness in.

The Facilitator read the comment on Weakness #2 - Letter was sent to Nature Conservancy addressed to Martha S. Cooper on January 21, 2011 inviting them to collaborate with Jose Barrios on this project. Numerous emails and phone calls were made in the attempt to receive an answer. On February 24 we were told to pick up letter at her office door and the letter in grant proposal is Nature Conservancy's response. She deferred to Long Mountain Natives who is one of our partners. Letter is found in appendix C.

The panel didn't remove that weakness.

Mr. Matush returned to the panel.

28-11

This one had no letter from Wellness Coalition.

The panel took out the Shawn Knox statement because it was included in the new overall section as Administrative Observations.

29-11

Mr. Matush recused himself and left the room.

No changes were noted on 29-11.

Mr. Matush returned to the panel. He noted that in the header Santa Fé Forest was wrong because it was

the Gila Forest.

30-11

There was a public comment received.

The Facilitator read it - The Sierra SWCD has historically worked very closely with the Sierra Club on numerous forest and bosque restoration projects. (It related specifically to the Weakness #4). When Sierra SWCD began developing this proposal for resubmission, we contacted the local chapter President, Ms. Margot Wilson, who verbally gave her support and committed to submitting a letter of support. However, when the time came close for the grant proposal submission she was out of the US and was not able to provide us a letter. When we realized we could not get a letter from the Sierra Club, we approached the Audubon, NM, a recent bosque restorative project partner, for a letter of support and that letter was included in the proposal.

No changes were made.

31-11

No comments were received.

Mr. Jervis noted that tribal letters were in both weakness and recommendations. He wanted to take it out of recommendation (#4) and leave the weakness. The panel agreed.

Mr. Gomez thought this weakness should be a boiler plate recommendation.

Mr. Dunn didn't see the point in having it both places.

Mr. Pohlman said they did have the one letter from a tribe.

Mr. Payne agreed and that is noted.

32-11

There was public comment on 32-11 specific to cost and budget figures. The public comment was - specific cost and budget figures were not included in partner support commitment letters in CFRP 32-11 because we, the project partners were not aware that it was required for non cost match budget items. In light of this, we respectfully request consideration of removal of this as a weakness in evaluating this project.

Mr. Jervis said they should leave it in. He suggested they re-spell Audubon.

33-11

The Facilitator already read the public comment for 33-11.

Mr. Archuleta thought they should leave it in.

Mr. Jervis said the panel discussed on this one about NEPA documentation that wasn't in the package. Barbara Johnson thought Dennis did a categorical exclusion on it. He was concerned on that because as the letter pointed out, it was not in Santo Domingo country - It is in Jemez Mountain territory.

So he wanted to add a weakness - *that the project is occurring in territory occupied by the Jemez Mountain Salamander and it is unclear whether appropriate mitigation measures are included in the NEPA documentation.*

The Facilitator said there was not an attachment to this. This was a conversation that the whole panel didn't have. It was a separate conversation. She asked panel members if it was out. This conversation was not part of the whole panel discussion.

Mr. Jervis said it was an ex parte communication with the proponent and not part of the whole panel conversation. The proponent in her letter acknowledged the presence of the salamander. It was not addressed in the proposal.

Mr. Pohlman thought maybe it might be in a recommendation.

Mr. Dunn said the problem is that he chose to handle that particular document and it might be an issue we have with him. That is why it might be more appropriate in the recommendations.

Mr. Cooke asked how the panel could say it is salamander country unless we know it is an occupied habitat. Just because it is in the general vicinity doesn't mean it is an occupied habitat.

Mr. Matush felt it could be handled by the applicant and a recommendation was not going to hurt the score.

Mr. Gomez amended the recommendation to say *that the project is occurring in territory <u>that might be</u> occupied by the Jemez Mountain Salamander and it is unclear whether appropriate mitigation measures are included in the NEPA documentation.*

Mr. Jervis noted the applicant admitted they were doing something about it in this territory and the salamanders don't migrate.

Mr. Jervis agreed to move it to recommendation. *The proposal could have been strengthened if the project had included acknowledgment of Jemez Mountain Salamander occupancy and mitigation in the proposal document.*

Mr. Gomez said the panel didn't have the NEPA document to review so that should be left out of the recommendation.

Mr. Vincent said in Weakness #17, 16' logs were acknowledged in the letter that they would stay on site. He thought they should remove Weakness #17.

The Panel agreed to remove Weakness #17.

Mr. Pohlman thought it was appropriate right there. It was important because he didn't make any estimate

of how much volume was coming off and it should have some indication. It went back to the way he looked at all of the proposals. And if it was going to be left on site for some purpose, that would be fine too.

Mr. Matush said Mr. Pohlman is right but at the same time, given the size of that watershed, they could have gotten a number and the panel would probably have been happy with any number given to them. He didn't think it was a deal breaker.

Mr. Racher agreed there was not a lot of material coming out but it wasn't estimated. It is not a deal changer. The panel said keep it.

Mr. Vincent disagreed.

Ms. Burnett pointed out that their letter had a lot more detail. Their proposal should have said they could not provide an estimate. She thought the weakness should stay because it forced them to look at it.

Mr. Matush said they could have given us any number so let's move on.

34-11

This proposal had public comment regarding missing support letters from New Mexico Game and Fish and NRCS.

Mr. Bird said the weakness should stay in.

Mr. Gomez thought they should reword the first weakness because it didn't make sense.

Mr. Barrone said they should keep it.

Mr. Berrens added- *In the letter that was attached it stated that the firewood would be removed before and after the burn.*

Mr. Racher asked if the letters were support letters or commitment letters.

Mr. Payne clarified that FS needed to look at them administratively so they would pull it administratively.

The Facilitator agreed. That is a flag for the FS to look at it.

This concluded the review of public comments.

The Facilitator had flagged the following proposals for possible re-scoring: 02-11, 04-11, 16-11, 19-11, 23-11, 24-11.

Mr. Gomez asked why 02-11 was in the list.

The Facilitator said it had been flagged earlier but in light of their discussion, probably it did not need to be in the list.

Mr. Gomez asked that they start at the top and make sure that any of the proposals that had changes did or did not need to be re-scored.

01-11

The panel did not want to re-score 01-11.

02-11

Mr. Racher wanted to re-score criterion 13 on 02-11.

Mr. Payne briefly explained the re-scoring process, handed out the scoring sheets. They realized that scoring sheets were unnecessary because everyone was writing a single number (one criterion on the proposal review). So the panel used the small note pads provided by the hotel to give their score after labeling the proposal number at the top of the page, then the criterion number and then the score number.

Mr. Matush was not present for this re-scoring.

Mr. Payne explained that it didn't matter if someone was not involved in the re-scoring because the average would be computed by dividing by the number of scores that were turned in.

Mr. Barrone asked if they needed to refrain from re-scoring if they were absent originally.

Mr. Payne said it was okay to re-score but the panel recommended they not re-score if they were absent the first time.

Mr. Dunn suggested if a panel member was absent the first time that they not re-score this time, just for consistency.

03-11

Mr. Gomez asked to re-score criterion 8.

The Facilitator said Weakness #8 was taken off and she had not flagged it.

In a brief discussion, the panel moved Weakness #9 to be a Recommendation.

The panel re-scored 03-11, criterion #8. Mr. Barrone was absent the first time and did not re-score and Mr. Gomez recused himself.

04-11

The panel agreed that criterion # 5 should be re-scored.

The panel re-scored 04-11, criterion #5. Mr. Barrone did not re-score because he was absent during the

first scoring.

Ms. San Gil briefly explained the double checking process on voting with two people.

05-11 through 15-11 were not re-scored.

16-11

Mr. Bird requested re-scoring on two criteria: #8 and #10.

The panel re-scored 16-11 on criteria 8 and 10.

One panel member recused on this re-scoring.

After the re-scoring was completed there was some confusion about two votes that had been mislabeled and the confusion was resolved.

19-11

The panel requested re-scoring on criterion #8 (weakness 9)

Ms. Watson was absent for the original scoring so she did not re-score on 19-11.

The panel re-scored 19-11, criterion #8.
20-11 through 22-11 were not flagged and were not re-scored.

23-11

The panel chose not to re-score 23-11.

24-11

The panel chose not to re-score 24-11.

Ms. Fisher asked for clarification on these two. Mr. Payne explained that they had dropped the administrative observation and then put it back in.

Proposals 06-11 and 25-11 through 35-11 were not flagged and were not re-scored.

Break- 11:40 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Final Results

Develop a prioritized list of recommended projects within each category of applications (planning, utilization, implementation)

Ms. San Gil displayed scoring on the proposals and invited people to go forward and examine them. Some people had trouble seeing them and they were enlarged.

The Planning proposals were listed as: 10, 13, 14, 12, 15 and 11 in rank order.

The Implementation proposals were listed as: 18, 06, 17, 25, 32, 23, 19, 30, 22, 28, 16, 33, 24, 34, 29, 31, 21, 27 and 20 in rank order.

The panel members reviewed the list and most wrote down the numbers from the prioritizations.

Mr. Dunn congratulated the panel for creating the prioritized lists of the proposals.

Review of Application Evaluation Process to Identify Areas for Improvement.

Mr. Dunn asked the panel to start with what went well and asked Ms. San Gil to put the comments on the screen.

Mr. Matush said they had a similar process with EPA and because he had done business in New Mexico for a long time, he was getting to know many applicants. Those who do better, he got to know them better and actually became friends with them. As a result, he felt he was becoming unsuitable to be on the panel without bias. You might start looking for people like Tim Pohlman, who are from out of state but familiar with New Mexico so they don't have any connection to any of the applicants. It is especially important when it comes to your job in helping those folks in managing the forest.

"I'm talking on my own behalf. I know too many of these people. I recused myself for this guy because I helped him with monitoring two years ago."

Compared to last year, the grading and scoring system streamlined it much better.

Mr. Jervis offered congratulations and a suggestion. Having the score sheets prior to the meeting was excellent and scoring them after the discussion was valuable.

He kept being concerned about coming to the end and talked about re-scoring them. What was going into the scoring decisions as the panel went through them might change and the panel didn't have control over that change. The good news is that the scoring process was less contentious and more worthwhile. What should be done next year is to prepare the same way but should discuss all of them and level all of the proposals. And then block out 2-3 hours and have all of the panel members sit down and score everything after the discussing and the leveling of everything.

That way the panel only ranks them once. Maybe panel members could score them at home beforehand but don't re-score them - just do them all at the end.

It would be a cleaner process if we sat down and the end to score them. He also thought it would be good to identify — "we didn't do any leveling with the strengths so were we consistent? Probably not. But

it should be scored at the end. Members could take their notes as they went and that would be fine but score them all at the end.

Ms. Burnett really liked this process this year. Thank you for working that out in the RFA. It is a much cleaner process. I like Tom Jervis' suggestion to score together at the end. I would like to refer to my other score sheets as I went. It would be better to do at the end.

Mr. Dunn thought that was something they could change easily. Panel members nodded their heads.

Mr. Payne asked if the proposals the panel discussed on Monday and Tuesday they could score as easily at the end.

Mr. Jervis said he could if he knew that was what he was going to do. He would come in and have them scored before he arrived for himself. As they went through the discussion, he would alter those scores and then at end would go back and look to make sure his scoring was consistent. He thought he could do that.

Mr. Archuleta liked the way that the process worked. It was a better way to actually get a good score. Regarding Mike Matush's comments he felt this would help level the bias. You could argue a strength and weakness but this would help take the bias factor out.

Mr. Matush felt there was no way to remove bias.

Mr. Archuleta said this would help to mitigate bias. He thought scoring at the end of each category rather than doing all of them at the end would be a little better. Mr. Jervis agreed.

Mr. Archuleta suggested that rather than having the same set of four boilerplate papers, the FS should take the time to categorize the strengths and weaknesses that apply to each criteria. It would make it easier and the review could be done by each category in the discussion. You would have category 1 and then category 2 and so forth so at the end of the discussion you would have the specific category.

Also there was a suggestion that came up early in the week regarding changing categories or adding additional points. Mr. Barrone had a good point about some of these businesses that have long standing existence and maybe that could be an additional criteria for that. He didn't have specific suggestions on that but maybe it could be included in the RFA next time. And also have a score for social values. Those were some things to think about when coming up with the criteria next time.

Mr. Cooke thought the panel spent a lot of time getting bogged down in the process. One of the things they spent a lot of time on was listing strengths. He asked if it was required, how it could be a strength.

A lot of process things could be pre-screened before we get to this meeting. The panel got bogged down and talked too much about process rather than the good things that mattered to the proposal itself.

He didn't like boilerplate strengths. He thought the panelists could list the strengths before the meeting and from that make a list of strengths and weaknesses and submit it a day or so beforehand so the panel didn't have to spend a lot of time to put boilerplate lists on the screen to copy.

Ms. San Gil pointed out that would mean everyone would have to read it beforehand and staff would have

to provide print outs of them.

Mr. Payne said the problem was that even with the boilerplates, they were getting some of these on Monday or Tuesday of last week.

Mr. Cooke agreed it might not be possible but thought it would speed up the process.

Mr. Dunn thought people would come and have it scored but then the presenter would have enormous sway over the presentation of a project. So that was why the FS got away from "preloaded." But he guessed if everyone submitted those strengths and weaknesses done it would help. He asked how it might work if they had no boilerplate strengths and weaknesses.

Mr. Cooke said that would be his vote.

Mr. Dunn was always leery about the boilerplates because they tended to be less precise and less specific. He was interested in knowing what the panel would say if they just got rid of the boilerplate.

Mr. Cooke said that was one of his suggestions.

Mr. Archuleta thought there was value in the boilerplates but they did lack specificity. You could look at them when going through the process could be specific in them to explain why.

Mr. Cooke said the other thing was to look at the 13 criteria. For him it was hard like in Criterion 1 - it was hard for him to vote concerning wildfire to actually raze and ecosystem function unless they had a good burning plan and said they were going to take fuel out of the forest and then trees up and all of that sort of stuff. Maybe the FS should look at some of these criteria and make sure they had a standalone value.

Mr. Dunn pointed out that the way it is worded is statutory but one thing they could do is - sometimes in the statutory language there are a couple of different contexts within one criterion so he could break them up.

Ms. San Gil asked Mr. Cooke which criteria he was referring to.

Mr. Cooke said he was talking about the 13.

Mr. Pohlman liked what Mr. Archuleta said about strengths and weaknesses fitting the criteria. At this point he thought he would be okay with leaving out the boilerplate. But they were immensely valuable last year so that he could key in on what was important in the process so he was a little ambivalent.

He thought this process takes a lot of bias off the table although he was conflicted about it a little bit. There might be a proposal or idea that has tremendous benefits but only on four of the criteria. It could be the greatest thing that has come along for those four criteria. It is very hard to score that particular project against others if it doesn't have all the components for all the different categories on them. He was not exactly sure how to fix that but he was concerned about it. Maybe it is a piece of equipment that would be hugely important but if the proposal doesn't plant trees or have a youth component in it might seem contrived and you can't bring it out.

Mr. Dunn said they worried that this process would make it hard for a project that did a few things spectacularly well that might be penalized compared to one that did all of the criteria marginally. That was a concern of his. He didn't know if this process did that or not.

Ms. Fisher thought it would be helpful if from here on out the RFA guidelines differentiated more standardized and leadership was very well versed and then go down that track. She would like to see the process steered more by the leadership.

Mr. Dunn explained that when he wrote the RFA he thought it was extremely clear but when other people interpret it, I say Oh.

Mr. Vincent said as a first timer he was thankful for everyone who organized it. He agreed with Mr. Jervis and Mr. Archuleta on having the discussion by categories. And then have the strengths and weaknesses for each criterion listed. He also felt there should be a "not applicable" category choice for the criteria.

Mr. Dunn said the challenge is that the statute is what it is. That was what the objective and purpose of the Act was so that was what the criteria were. So he couldn't say those didn't apply. Then the question becomes when you look at them, do you mean potentially or actually? That's the real question.

Ms. Fisher thought it did apply. In some of the areas it could be potentially and actually.

Mr. Archuleta asked if the statute said you shall do all of them or could it allow for a Not Applicable.

Mr. Dunn replied that unfortunately it said "shall."

Mr. Jervis thought that next year, because of the criteria and people having seen how they add up, the panel would see a lot of projects that would find a place to plant a tree, even if they were thinning. He was not sure that was the intent. The panel shouldn't look so closely at them. An applicant would see that they could get more points for planting something.

Mr. Bird said he was going to flag the potential for abuse in the three categories and how many were funded in each category. If you wanted a better chance of getting funded you would apply in more than one. It is just one point to think about.

Mr. Dunn was not sure jumping into the implementation race was the way to go. The question here is, "Is the way we divided them into the 3 categories an effective means to compare apples to apples?"

Mr. Payne pointed out that not all of them would have treatment.

Mr. Gomez thought it would be good to have a reference at the bottom on each criterion from the RFA or from the statute. Then the panelist could go to the reference and research them. The panel spent a lot of time going back to the statute.

Mr. Dunn agreed he could do that but those that were from the Act were all verbatim in the application.

Ms. Watson, regarding strengths and weaknesses, thought it would be nice to start a new process - that we

take out all strengths and weaknesses. There is a lot of room for grey. After being on the panel you can tell if it is well written. And looking at the RFA, you know what is required.

Mr. Payne explained that the reason for the boilerplate is to help speed up the typing. What you are saying would work but getting them to us before would help.

Mr. Dunn agreed they could do that and had done it before. Since they had a new process now, it would make sense to start over. You would develop a new set of boilerplate statements that way.

Mr. Barrone thought, as a first timer, that the boilerplate really helped him see what he was looking for. He learned a lot this year. The other thing is that some of us represent the industry and the commodity. But there is nothing in the criteria that deal with industry and commodity. Has the company been in business a long time? Are there other businesses in the area that are doing the same thing? No weight is given to industry.

Mr. Dunn said that was because we were not thinking of industry when we wrote the RFA.

Mr. Archuleta thought there was room within the scoring to address that. Mr. Dunn agreed.

Ms. San Gil said in the Utilization category there was a focus on some of those businesses but not all of them.

Mr. Barrone agreed with Mr. Archuleta that a business that has been in business for 25 years should count for value in scoring.

Mr. Berrens thought the panel did a good job this year. They worked hard and came up with good judgments. But he wondered if when they came up with this big 50 page list if would be too intimidating to the applicant. It seemed they were too hard on some of those applicants.

At the end of the day, you know the composition of the panel and put them in categories. What you should say to the applicant is “here is how 15 people reacted to what you proposed.” What matters to people is what average score you got and to ask how they could raise that. That would be more useful to people. The panel was spending too much time on the language around a strength or a weakness. What mattered to people was the average score and how to improve it. We are in a mode now ten years into the process getting far more applications than we have money for.

Ms. Burnett thought that is good feedback because there was a bit of disconnect when strengths and weaknesses didn’t match up. By default it was worse with feedback so she agreed on that.

Mr. Archuleta agreed and was why he kept saying it must be linked with criteria. Feedback needs to help the proponent know how they could improve their score. Just having a straight number is not that helpful. Giving feedback within each category would be better.

Mr. Dunn agreed the report does need to give some insight into why they got a low score on a criterion.

Mr. Olivas said maybe on Mr. Bird’s point where there were multiple possibilities in categories that [one of them] in his opinion should have been utilization. The point is that there was discussion like the letter and the Old Wood that Mr. Payne said if we had left everyone in there, maybe FS should weed them out before they got to the Panel. There were 5-6 that could have been thrown out.

Mr. Payne said to Mr. Olivas that he had just made the point that the panel should do the elimination. The panel suggested they would make their own boilerplate. He asked if the panel wanted strengths and weaknesses [boilerplate] in the criteria or no boilerplate.

Mr. Gomez thought it would be helpful because they had three categories and should have strengths and weaknesses for each category.

Mr. Dunn said he could look at the existing boilerplates and try to make them into questions that would require the panelists to fill in more information and then he could make an effort to match those up to specific criteria but he really preferred to consider throwing out the boilerplate.

Mr. Gomez countered that some of the criteria didn't fit the plan and asked why he had criteria that wouldn't fit at all.

Mr. Dunn said as he stated in the beginning that the criteria come from the statute and that gives the eligibility criteria.

The Facilitator reminded the panel that this evaluation of the process.

Ms. Burnett had a concern about pre-voting the strengths and weaknesses. She thought they could end up having a lot more conflict. The volume of the text would be very large. Secondly what she made as a strength, others disagreed. There was a chance of having things left that conflicted. It could end up being a logistical problem with so much stuff.

Mr. Vincent was concerned that they might not have any boilerplate but as a first timer, he found them most useful.

Ms. San Gil thought in the process of having criteria, if they were to throw out the boilerplate, the panel would still have the notes of strengths and weaknesses from this year. So, although they would be creating new ones, it still would be more accurate and could reduce the criticism that the strengths and weaknesses did not reflect the criteria.

Mr. Dunn agreed but the panel would have to invent them.

Ms. Burnett felt the range on the number of points range at 5 was a lot.

Mr. Jervis regarding boilerplate and correlation to the criteria he thought the boilerplates could be culled substantially. He asked the list be examined. Some that were never brought up this year could be taken out. The same could be done for the collaboration forms issue.

They are useful for both new and more experienced panelists. He might not remember that stuff from when he was on the panel a few years earlier. But he cautioned in tying the strengths and weaknesses too closely to the criteria. If he was writing a proposal to make sure he had checked all the boxes. And if the panel didn't rate that higher, this guy would come back to Mr. Dunn to complain. So it should not be made into a check list. He would rather not see the strengths and weaknesses tied to the criteria directly. They were going to reflect the criteria but it should not be a checklist mentality. That would not be helpful to the panel or the applicants. The RFA should focus on what they were going to do and how they do it. Strengths and weaknesses should reflect that but they shouldn't be tied to

directly. The scoring is subjective and this is what we are asked to do.

Mr. Pohlman thought it would be interesting to see the comparison of individual scores with its strengths. In any of those strengths there is a breadth of quality in the components. You see something that is a pretty good effort and give it a good score. What if you could only have so many strengths in a review? He didn't know how that would be done.

Mr. Jervis thought they could just say no more than 6 on any proposal.

Mr. Archuleta disagreed with the idea of narrowing the range of 1-5. How he rated a youth component was in light of the entire proposal. It was important to tie it together. In the past, they want to eliminate weaknesses. But he didn't see a problem with a strength and a weakness that conflicted. That helped the panel find the right ranking in the 0-5 range.

Mr. Dunn thanked the panel for giving him a lot of feedback on the process.

Before they went to the feedback on the RFA he wanted to comment about the bias that Mr. Matush brought up. This is not the same as panels that review independently. This panel has people with experience of restoration in New Mexico so that the projects recommended for funding, each member of the panel would support when they go home. He had argued that in Washington DC that it brings agreement on what is important in forest restoration in New Mexico. So if there are projects that do what they really believe in, that's fine. And over the ten year period, that had made a huge difference in the quality of projects funded in New Mexico.

Mr. Dunn said he had always argued it was not like a typical grant review process where everyone was unbiased and neutral. It was more like a City Council than and an independent third party review panel.

Feedback on 2011 RFA

Review 2011 Request for Applications to identify areas for improvement

Mr. Racher said this was dictated to them on planning. With that said, he understood why those numbers were set. In the past and also today the panel found some planning and utilization proposals that would affect the future. So when setting those amounts we reflect not what our needs were in the past but what our needs are into the future. For example we fund some planning for landscape and if more is needed in the future, he was fine with that. Some of our planning will be on a smaller scale in more focused areas on utilization and then the acreage treated with the dollars can be leveraged into other funding sources for implementation. But where this fits best is in implementation projects where we may or might not be able to fund.

Mr. Dunn asked what his point was.

Mr. Racher said they might need more utilization projects in the future and fewer planning proposals.

Mr. Dunn didn't know that was a specific enough recommendation although he understood the point.

Mr. Racher didn't know how they could address those needs.

Mr. Archuleta asked how he determined it now for how many to fund.

Mr. Dunn said they looked at the trend in past years and then thought about the individual intent of the Act which had a thrust of implementation. The utilization and planning projects had evolved out of that and were very appropriate. They had to separate them out because they were apples and oranges. So they looked at the ratio in the past.

Mr. Payne said they also had discussions with the forests.

Mr. Dunn agreed. They saw that in the NEPA here.

Mr. Archuleta understood.

Mr. Dunn added that it was also based on the percentage of proposals that came in. Utilization usually means buying a lot of equipment and there was a lot of concern about that.

Ms. San Gil clarified that while this program had money, they didn't have with NEPA because budgets were tight. Where legislatively they were responding to the Act but the forests don't have the money to prepare the acres.

Mr. Dunn said that was part of training the Navajo crew. Traditionally, the FS felt they had to do all of it. But maybe that isn't the case. What can partners do and what can grantees do that would help? That was a very fluid learning curve.

Ms. San Gil added that they didn't have businesses coming to ask for them.

Mr. Archuleta said one way to do that in utilization is that you could include marking the trees.

Mr. Dunn agreed and they saw it in the Navajo proposal.

Mr. Archuleta thought it was a way to get acres cleared for NEPA. It is a trend. Those proposals rise to the top. So in terms of planning, there is a lot of landscape process going on now. It is good for the US FS to get something out of it as the largest landholder. But there are small scale planning needs that should not be thrown out. Land Grants had no other source for NEPA but the CFRP and it was the same for tribes.

There have been lots of FS large scale planning projects. So next year perhaps that could be given consideration.

Mr. Pohlman suggested maybe reserving one project for something that came in that was really big and really good like a floater. The RFA said to fund this many planning and this many implementation and if they funded one less in order to have flexibility to add one more project in a particular

category, it would be good. Usually the top projects were within one or two points of each other.

Ms. Burnett asked if it was even necessary to give a number for each category in the RFA.

Mr. Dunn said it wasn't required. The panel could decide how it wanted to structure its recommendation. The FS decided on the funding numbers.

Ms. Burnett explained that she was expecting today when the panel was ranking that someone might stand up and say that sort of thing.

Mr. Dunn said the panel's job in the charter and statute is to say which projects best meet the objectives and goals of the Act and the panel did that very well this year. The panel's job is to do the ranking and the FS is to make the final decision. This year we don't know about the money.

Ms. Burnett thought they should discuss that as a panel.

Mr. Dunn said it was possible to take it out. He understood the discomfort about up to two and up to four but he was also not hearing very clearly how to do it otherwise - other than just to wrestle with it.

Mr. Archuleta suggested the RFA could say the number funded would be proportional to the number of applications so the competition would be about the same for each category.

Mr. Payne said the forests encouraged us to not do a lot of utilizations this year.

Mr. Vincent suggested that they address it all on economic sustainability. The projects should be economically sustainable. The law is the law however. He also wondered if the law on cap of large trees could be amended.

Mr. Dunn considered that somewhat irrelevant how he would feel about it. He had made a couple of runs on technical amendments to statutes. Sometimes it speeded it up and sometimes slowed it down. In the current congress he felt there was zero opportunity to change the large tree issue.

Mr. Racher said last year there was redefining of conservation measures.

Mr. Dunn said the reason that definition appeared and he sent it around was that we used to spend time arguing about it. It was inefficient and used a lot of time so we developed that definition. He could take it out and try to get more agreement on it but they used to argue about it a lot. One time they called up two people from the Forest Guild and got two different answers.

Mr. Racher said he was proposing to re-look at the definition because it was wider and more inclusive.

Mr. Dunn said he could send it back out and the panel members could give him more input.

Mr. Archuleta thought it was more important then, than now.

This feedback concluded at 1:33 p.m.

Tasks for CFRP Sub Committee

Mr. Dunn announced that in September they planned to have a subcommittee meeting to look at multi-party issues to see what they tell us cumulatively about accomplishments in the CFRP program and secondly to this panel to get feedback to the panel and look at the socio-economic indicators.

If anyone was interested, they should let Mr. Dunn know. The subcommittee didn't have to be members of the panel. It could also have subject matter experts.

Mr. Dunn thought this panel had been an extraordinary example of civic participation and he was proud to be part of it and proud to have been its chairman.

Public Comment Period

Mr. David Cordova was given an opportunity to read a written comment. But instead, he made extemporaneous comments. His written statement said - 1) Believe this is open to possible litigation. 2) Everyone was not graded the same way - planning, utilization, and implementation. 3) Disqualified proposal stats?

Mr. Dunn re-clarified that the only comments that could be included in the minutes were those that were written.

Closing Remarks

There were no other closing remarks.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.