



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

**Southwestern
Region**

July 2012



Project Funding Recommendations and Proposed Evaluation Comments

2012 Technical Advisory Panel Collaborative Forest Restoration Program

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Application Review Process	3
2012 Applications	5
Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations	11
Recommendations for Improving the RFA and the Panel Evaluation Process.....	57
Appendix A. Technical Advisory Panel Bylaws.....	59
Appendix B. April 23-27, 2012, Meeting Participants	63
Appendix C: Criteria Scores for Applications by Category Sorted Highest to Lowest	65
Appendix D: Grants Recommended for Funding.....	67

Executive Summary

The Collaborative Forest Restoration Program (CFRP) Technical Advisory Panel (Panel) met in Albuquerque, New Mexico, April 23-27, 2012, to provide the USDA Forest Service with recommendations on which grant applications submitted for funding under the CFRP best met the program objectives. The Secretary of Agriculture chartered the Panel for 2 years as a Federal Advisory Committee on May 4, 2010 (DR 1042-138) pursuant to the Community Forest Restoration Act of 2000 (Title VI, Pub. L. No. 106-393). The meeting was open to the public. 12 Panel members attended the meeting. Shawn Fisher and Arturo Archuletta were unable to attend.

The Panel reviewed their Bylaws and responsibilities under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, appointed one of the Panel members (Brent Racher) to serve as Chairman, discussed CFRP accomplishments and challenges, reviewed and finalized the CFRP Subcommittee Report and reviewed 43 grant applications totaling \$13,141,182. The Panel eliminated 12 applications from consideration because they were missing information required by the 2012 CFRP Request for Applications (RFA). Panel members considered information presented during the public comment periods and then conducted a consistency review of their comments on each application. The Panel also provided recommendations for improving the Panel review process and RFA.

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

The Panel Chairman approved the list recommending funding for 11 of the 2012 CFRP grant applications totaling \$3,175,000 (the funding available for CFRP grants in fiscal year 2012) on May 23, 2012. The Southwestern Regional Forester approved that recommendation on May 25. The Regional Forester sent the list of recommended projects to the Chief of the Forest Service on June 26 with a decision memo for the Secretary of Agriculture to make the final decision on CFRP grant funding in 2012. Grant award letters will be issued by the appropriate administering National Forest following approval by the Secretary.

This report includes: An overview of the application review process; Strengths, weaknesses, recommendations and scores for the eligible 2012 CFRP applications; a table summarizing the scores and rankings for each application reviewed; project scores for each criteria; recommendations for improving the proposal review process and RFA; a list of projects the Regional Forester approved and submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for final approval; a list of Panel members; and Panel Bylaws. This report, the Meeting Minutes (including the meeting agenda), the Panel Charter, the Federal Register Announcement for the Panel meeting, the 2012 RFA and the Subcommittee Report can be obtained on the CFRP website (<http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/r3/cfrp>) or by contacting Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, 333 Broadway Blvd. SE, Albuquerque, NM 87102, telephone (506) 842-3425.

Application Review Process

The Forest Service sorted applications into three categories prior to the Panel meeting: 1) implementation of on the ground restoration treatments; 2) planning, assessment and NEPA compliance; and 3) small diameter tree utilization. The Panel reviewed administrative observations provided by Forest Service staff prior to the Panel meeting and then used a consensus based process to identify strengths and weaknesses for each eligible application. Panel members individually filled out a score sheet indicating how well the applicant addressed each of the evaluation criteria (0=not at all, 5=exceptionally well).

The Panel eliminated 12 of the 43 applications from further consideration because they were missing specific information required in the 2012 Request for Applications. Applications were eliminated for the following reasons: NEPA decision documents missing or not applicable to the proposed project; missing letters of commitment from project partners for whom specific roles were described in the project budget and/or work plan; SF 424 grant application forms not signed and/or dated. Six applications were eliminated from consideration at the beginning of the meeting due to these reasons and six more were found to be intelligible during the Panel review process.

Public comment periods were scheduled each day, and members of the public could bring application review matters to the attention of the Panel during those periods if they provided written comments to the Forest Service staff in advance. After all the applications were reviewed, the Panel considered the information presented during public comment periods as well as the strengths, weaknesses and recommendations for each application and made corrections when necessary for consistency.

Following the consistency check Forest Service staff calculated the average score for each application and created a table listing the applications from highest to lowest score. The Panel then scored each application for its effect on long term management.

The Southwestern Region of the Forest Service received \$4 million in fiscal year 2012 to implement the CFRP. Of that amount \$3,175,000 was available for grant awards. On May 25, 2012, after consulting the scores and recommendations of the CFRP Technical Advisory Panel, the Forest Service Regional Forester, Southwestern Region, approved the Panel recommendation to fund 11 of the 2012 CFRP grant applications totaling \$3,175,000. Additional funding, should it become available, would be awarded to the next highest scoring application. On June 26, 2012, the Regional Forester sent his recommendation to the Chief of the Forest Service to transmit to the Secretary of Agriculture for final funding approval. A table is attached listing the projects the Regional Forester Recommended funding (Appendix D).

Evaluation Criteria

The Panel evaluated each project proposal using the following criteria:

1. Will the proposed project reduce the threat of large, high intensity wildfires and the negative effects of excessive competition between trees by restoring ecosystem functions (including healthy watersheds), structures, and species composition, including the reduction of non-native species populations?
2. Will the proposed project re-establish fire regimes approximating those that shaped forest ecosystems prior to fire suppression?
3. Will the proposed project replant trees in deforested areas, if they exist, in the proposed project area?

4. Will the proposed project improve the use of, or add value to, small diameter trees?
5. Will the proposed project include a diverse and balanced group of stakeholders as well as appropriate Federal, Tribal, State, County, Land Grant, and Municipal government representatives in the design and implementation of the project? (Conservation Groups are non-government, non-commodity groups whose objectives include forest restoration, biodiversity and/or habitat conservation, education and/or outreach.)
6. Does the proposal include a plan for a multiparty assessment that will:
 - a. Identify both the existing ecological condition of the proposed project area and the desired future condition; and
 - b. Monitor and report on the positive or negative impact and effectiveness of the project including improvements in local management skills and on the ground results?
7. Does the project proposal incorporate current scientific forest restoration information?
8. Will the proposed project preserve old and large trees?
9. Will the proposed project create local employment or training opportunities within the context of accomplishing restoration objectives and include summer youth job programs, such as the Youth Conservation Corps, where appropriate?
10. Have the proponents demonstrated the capability to successfully implement the proposed project?
11. Does the proposal facilitate landscape-scale, multi-jurisdictional efforts?
12. Is the proposed activity in a priority area for hazardous fuel reduction?
13. Is the cost of the project reasonable and within the range of the fair market value for similar work?
14. Will the proposed project have a positive effect on long term management? Under this criteria the Panel identified the following considerations:
 - Best return on the investment to accomplish CFRP purposes and objectives
 - Innovation that makes appropriate forest management more cost efficient
 - Contribution to accomplishing larger landscape scale objectives
 - Part of a landscape scale effort within an area that leads to land and watershed protection
 - The ability to act as a catalyst to increase the effectiveness of projects beyond the one being proposed
 - Facilitates protection of communities from wildfire
 - Allows more flexibility in wild land fire management
 - Ability to create assets that are capable of generating net benefit streams past this project
 - Increases community awareness and acceptance of fire's role in the landscape
 - Creating utilization infrastructure
 - Self-sustaining businesses
 - The extent to which the proposal builds on (innovation and experimentation) previous CFRP projects as opposed to repeating previous CFRP accomplishments
 - Maintaining local sustainable forest industries that provide land managers with a source (of workers) for removing excessive fuels and establishing healthy forests
 - Collaboration between using small diameter timber and a market based approach
 - Commitment to follow up first entry with second entry to avoid losing fire benefits gained
 - Most bang for the buck while protecting life and limb, creating jobs, utilizing materials and creating better managed forests

2012 Applications

Table 1. Technical Advisory Panel Scoring of Applications by Category

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Match	Total	Score
CFRP 01-12	Planning - Carson	Rio Tusas-Lower San Antonio Landscape	GIV	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	42.78
CFRP 02-12, Rev 1	Planning - Carson	Planning - Collaborative Landscape Restoration of the Middle Ponil Watershed	Cimarron Watershed Alliance Inc.	Non-Profit	\$297,587	\$74,639	\$372,226	38.22
CFRP 03-12	Planning - Gila	Building Capacity & Diverse Partnerships Across Multiple Landscapes Through Improved Project Preparation	New Mexico Forest Industry Association	Non-Profit	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	47.88
CFRP 05-12	Planning - Lincoln	South Central New Mexico Multi-Jurisdictional Landscape Planning	Eastern New Mexico University - Ruidoso	School	\$338,667	\$86,843	\$425,510	33.90
CFRP 06-12, Rev. 1	Planning - Cibola	Collaborative, Landscape-Scale Restoration Planning in the Chuska Mountains, Navajo Nation	San Juan Soil & Water Conservation District	State Govt	\$275,200	\$68,800	\$344,000	43.00
CFRP 07-12	Planning - Cibola	Multi-Agency, Restoration Planning Near the Community of La Madera, Sandia Mountains, NM	Forest Fitness, LLC	Business	\$250,853	\$62,702	\$313,555	44.18
CFRP 08-12, Rev. 1	Utilization - Cibola	Improved Utilization of Small Diameter Trees in Central New Mexico 2012	Roger Tucker, Inc.	Business	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$150,000	48.36
CFRP 09-12	Utilization - Cibola	Increased Production and Processing of Small Diameter Trees in Socorro County	New Mexico Forest Restoration Products	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	45.18
CFRP 10-12	Utilization - Cibola	Building a Sustainable Wood Program in the Albuquerque Bosque	Tree New Mexico	Non-Profit	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	31.36

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Match	Total	Score
CFRP 11-12	Utilization - Santa Fe	Crossing Boundaries with Small Tree Utilization in the Jemez Mountains	TC Company	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	50.91
CFRP 12-12	Utilization - Lincoln	Utilization of Biomass Waste for Renewable Energy	New Mexico Biomass Technologies, LLC	Business	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$150,000	44.10
CFRP 14-12	Utilization - Carson	Utilizing, Transporting & Adding Value to Small Diameter Trees or Timber (SDT)	Silver Dollar Racing & Shavings	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	45.64
CFRP 15-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Seven Springs Hazardous Fuel Reduction Project	Cordova Logging Inc.	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	44.91
CFRP 17-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Los Indios Post-Fire Rehabilitation and Riparian Forest Restoration Implementation Project	WildEarth Guardians	Non-Profit	\$240,000	\$60,000	\$300,000	35.90
CFRP 18-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Multi-Jurisdictional, Watershed Scale Restoration in Barbero Canyon, Rowe Mesa, NM	NorthEastern Contractors, LLC	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	44.40
CFRP 19-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Collaborative Post Fire Restoration in Santa Clara Canyon	Pueblo of Santa Clara	Tribe	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	38.55
CFRP 21-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Gallinas Watershed Implementation Project (Calf Canyon WUI)	Southwest Wood Products & Thinning	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	47.25
CFRP 22-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Diego/Chaparral Wild Land Urban Interface Treatment Project	Padilla Logging	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	44.30
CFRP 23-12	Implementation - Gila	Implementation of Fuel Reduction and Bosque Restoration Next to Percha Dam Recreation Site	Sierra Soil & Water Conservation District	State Govt	\$143,439	\$28,692	\$172,131	36.01

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Match	Total	Score
CFRP 24-12	Implementation - Gila	Gila Wood Products & Kellar Logging Collaborative Restoration Thinning and Market Fulfillment Partnership	Gila Wood Products, LLC	Business	\$359,881	\$89,979	\$449,860	47.95
CFRP 25-12	Implementation - Gila	Expanding a Traditionally Non-Commercial Firewood Market of Sustainably Harvested Pinyon from the Burro Mountain Homestead WUI Restoration Project	Gila Tree Thinners	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	44.66
CFRP 26-12	Implementation - Carson	Healthy Forests Healthy Communities in Vallecitos	Alfonso Chacon Jr.	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	47.05
CFRP 27-12	Implementation - Carson	Implementation of Forest Restoration within Maquinitas Analysis Area	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps	Non-Profit	\$359,468	\$89,999	\$449,467	47.19
CFRP 28-12	Implementation - Carson	Ecosystem Process Restoration through Prescribed Fire Capacity Building in Black Lake	Forest Guild	Non-Profit	\$137,469	\$34,367	\$171,836	52.44
CFRP 29-12, Rev 1	Implementation - Carson	Forest Restoration & Education in the Aqua Caballos Vallacitos Sustained Yield Unit	Joe Gurule & Son	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	41.45
CFRP 30-12	Implementation - Carson	Implementation: Mesa Juan Domingo Pinion/ Juniper Forest Restoration and Fuel Reduction in the Canjilon WUI	La Alba, LLC	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	45.45
CFRP 31-12	Implementation - Carson	Implementation: Chimayo Conservation Corps Developing Local Capacity to Restore Forest Health	Chimayo Conservation Corps	Non-Profit	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	45.45

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Match	Total	Score
CFRP 32-12	Implementation - Carson	Implementation: Quality Environmental and Economic Sustainability Projects-Phase II	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products	Business	\$216,541	\$54,134	\$270,675	43.64
CFRP 34-12	Implementation - Carson	Implementation: Maquinita Ecosystem Health Project	Kuykendall & Sons Sawmill	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000	50.45
CFRP 35-12	Implementation-Lincoln	Implementation of Pre-Commercial Thinning and Fuels Reduction in Bear Canyon	Turkey Creek Forestry Service, Inc.	Business	\$352,381	\$88,100	\$440,481	39.91
CFRP 37-12	Implementation-Lincoln	White Fire Restoration & Education Implementation CFRP Proposal	South Central Mountains Resource Conservation and Development Council	Non-Profit	\$192,289	\$49,614	\$241,903	39.61
SUBTOTAL:					\$9,523,775	\$2,377,869	\$11,901,644	

Table 2. Applications Eliminated from Consideration Due to Missing Information Required by Request For Application

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title / Missing Information	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Match	Total
CFRP 04-12	Planning - Lincoln	NEPA Assessment of Forest Restoration Activities Missing: Letter of commitment from M3Research	Otero County NM Board of Commissioners	Local Govt	\$170,250	\$58,720	\$228,970

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title / Missing Information	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Match	Total
CFRP 13-12	Utilization - Gila	Demonstration Site Development of Zerosion, an Engineered Composite Biomass Erosion Control Material, Using Low Value Biomass Generated from Forest Treatment in Grant County Missing: Letter of commitment from Soilutions	Restoration Technologies, LLC	Business	\$359,820	\$90,000	\$449,819
CFRP 16-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Reducing Wildfire Risk & Improving Forest Health in the Santa Fe County Wildland Urban Interface Missing: Letter of commitment from Community of La Cueva, Santa Fe Community College & Santa Fe County Open Space	Santa Fe County Fire Dept.	Local Govt	\$359,112	\$81,951	\$441,063
CFRP 20-12	Implementation - Santa Fe	Las Vegas (Gallinas) Municipal Watershed WUI Fuels Reduction Project Phase 2 Missing: Letter of commitment from Clarence Montoya	Griegos Logging, LLC	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000
CFRP 33-12	Implementation - Carson	Raton Post-Wildfire Restoration Missing: NEPA Incomplete, Decision Memo does not support the proposed activities	County of Colfax	Local Govt	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000
CFRP 36-12	Implementation- Lincoln	Implementation of Bog Springs Wetlands Restoration Missing: Letter of commitment from Hammerstone Archeological	Village of Ruidoso	Local Govt	\$117,439	\$29,860	\$147,299
CFRP 38-12, Rev. 1	Implementation- Gila	The Wellness Coalition/Youth Conservation Corps Forest Restoration Project (Resubmitted) Missing: NEPA Decision Document	The Wellness Coalition	Non-Profit	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title / Missing Information	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Match	Total
CFRP 39-12	Implementation- Santa Fe	Ponderosa Pine and Xeric Mixed Conifer Restoration on the Valles Caldera National Preserve Missing: Signature and date on SF 424	Los Amigos de Valles Caldera	Non-Profit	\$330,947	\$82,739	\$413,686
CFRP 40-12, Rev. 1	Implementation- Santa Fe	Sustainable Riparian Forest Restoration at Ohkay Owingeh, Nambe Pueblo, and Orilla Verde Recreation Area Missing: Date on SF 424	Ohkay Owingeh	Tribal	\$359,839	\$89,960	\$449,799
CFRP 41-12	Implementation- Gila	Restoration of Pronghorn Habitat in Moraga Canyon Missing: NEPA Decision Document	A & A Forestry	Business	\$120,000	\$30,000	\$150,000
CFRP 42-12	Utilization - Lincoln	Utilization: La Luz Sort Yard & Small Log Processing Center Missing: Letter of commitment from Mark Hare	Ellinger Logger	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000
CFRP 43-12	Implementation - Cibola	Implementation of Forest Restoration in the Cibola Missing: Letters of commitment from: NMFIA, NM Recycling Coalition, City of Grants	Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC	Business	\$360,000	\$90,000	\$450,000
INELIGABLE TOTAL					\$3,617,407	\$913,230	\$4,530,636
TOTAL OF ALL 43 PROPOSALS					\$13,141,182	\$3,291,099	\$16,432,280

Strengths, Weaknesses and Recommendations

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 01-12
CATEGORY:	Planning
ORGANIZATION:	GIV
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Rio Tusas-Lower San Antonio Landscape
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	42.78

STRENGTHS

1. The application offers a very good opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes, with very strong letters of commitment from permittees to rest and rotate livestock grazing to support successful prescribed fire.
2. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
3. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
4. The application includes strong letters of support.
5. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
6. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
7. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration and adds a capacity for small utilization for green Aspen latillas, as well as establishing opportunities to manage the elk herds for prescribed fire.
8. The project includes a good youth component.
9. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
10. The application includes collaborator interest forms.
11. The letter from the District Ranger commits to leveraging grant dollars with forest service resources, educating land owners within and adjacent to project area, and encouraging actions on private lands.
12. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
13. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
14. The application includes very useful, informative maps of the proposal.
15. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.

WEAKNESSES

1. The project and budget narrative do not include a clear description of the activities to be performed by the Quivera Coalition and The Nature Conservancy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent and the Forest should consider a pathway for funding implementation after NEPA is accomplished.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations

2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
3. The application should address the program provisions for preserving old and large trees.
4. The work plan should indicate when the Biological Assessment will be completed.
5. In cases where elk herds and livestock grazing occurs, the applicant is encouraged to seek a commitment from both Game and Fish and grazing permittees to manage the elk herd and manage sufficient rest to support prescribed fire.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. Verify whether FS Enterprise teams can receive funding from Federal financial assistance grants and that a competitive process will be used to hire contractors.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 02-12
CATEGORY:	Planning
ORGANIZATION:	Cimarron Watershed
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Planning - Collaborative Landscape Restoration of the Middle Ponil Watershed
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 297,587
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 74,639
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 372,226
EVALUATION SCORE:	38.22

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
7. Applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations. Inclusion of the seasonality of work as a major issue in the NEPA analysis is commendable.
8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration that includes numerous watershed activities and improvements above and beyond upland thinning.

WEAKNESSES

1. The budget does not include how the project would measure sediment or temperature, which is required baseline data for analysis.

2. The cost of the educational component is an inappropriately large percentage of the total budget.
3. Pinyon-juniper restoration objectives are not addressed in the application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent and the Forest should consider a pathway for funding implementation after NEPA is accomplished.
2. In cases where elk herds and livestock grazing occurs, the applicant is encouraged to seek a commitment from both Game and Fish and grazing permittees to manage the elk herd and manage grazing to support prescribed fire.
3. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. Federal financial assistance grants cannot be used to reimburse the Forest Service for supplies. On Page J1 in appendices, and in the budget (part of \$39,000 in the stand inventory includes \$1,000 reimbursement for the FS Supplies).
2. Collaborator / contractor letter (E4) does not verify match from River Source described in the detailed budget narrative (\$50,347 on page 4). The proposed scope of work is included in J3 to J5 but it is not attached to the signed letter of commitment.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 03-12
CATEGORY:	Planning
ORGANIZATION:	New Mexico Forest Industry Association
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Building Capacity & Diverse Partnerships Across Multiple Landscapes Through Improved Project Preparation
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	47.88

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application includes strong letters of support.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
7. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
8. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
9. The project will create new jobs that will expand and continue to exist after the grant period.

10. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments, especially the Alamo Navajo School Board project and the NMFIA project.
11. The jobs created will be career jobs, fill a gap that the federal agencies and tribal entities cannot perform, and will speed up the process of evaluation and utilization.
12. The inclusion of socio-economic monitoring of timeline measures after preparation activities, relating to raw materials received and how long it takes to get projects contracted is commendable.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. For the collaborators that are providing a contracted service, the proposal would be strengthened with a quote accompanying their commitment letter.
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 04-12
CATEGORY:	Planning
ORGANIZATION:	Otero County NM Board of Commissioners
FOREST:	Lincoln
PROJECT TITLE:	NEPA Assessment of Forest Restoration Activities
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 170,250
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 58,720
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 228,970
EVALUATION SCORE:	Eliminated from consideration due to missing letter from M3 Research

STRENGTHS

1. The area that will be treated affects a lot of people and NM tourism.
2. The application will preserve old and large trees.
3. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
4. The application includes strong letters of support.
5. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
6. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. Otero County is providing a cash match to support the project which is commendable, especially during these tough economic times.
10. The application provides good specifics regarding what they are going to measure and demonstrates competence in ecosystem restoration, with a clear explanation and directions on how they plan to mitigate the overstocked forest.
11. The project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.

WEAKNESSES

1. Poor quality map.
2. There was no mention of attending the CFRP annual workshop.
3. Monitoring plan is vague and does not monitor the activities in the work plan.
4. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation and forest industry groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
5. The application did not include documentation of consultation with all potentially affected tribes.
6. Detailed budget does not follow Request for Application budget format.
7. Budget does not include clear unit costs.
8. The application does not include a letter of commitment from M3Research, and is therefore eliminated from consideration by the Panel.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The application would be strengthened by the incorporation of a youth component.
2. We strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised application next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.
3. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
4. Documentation of letters sent to other potentially affected tribes should be included.
5. The application should include information regarding the age class distribution and size class of the forest they are planning to treat.
6. Secure an archeologist and a letter of commitment that includes costs for the heritage surveys.
7. The applicants are encouraged to expand collaboration to other groups and entities to strengthen the application.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The non-federal match in the budget should be limited to 20 percent. Any overmatch should be described in the budget narrative.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 05-12
CATEGORY:	Planning
ORGANIZATION:	Eastern New Mexico University - Ruidoso
FOREST:	Lincoln
PROJECT TITLE:	South Central New Mexico Multi-Jurisdictional Landscape Planning
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 338,667
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 86,843
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 425,510
EVALUATION SCORE:	33.90

STRENGTHS

1. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts through creating a planning tool that will serve as a model and tool for future planning and data integration and could facilitate project prioritization across multijurisdictional boundaries.
2. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
3. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
4. The project includes a good youth component.
5. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
6. The project will create new jobs.
7. Good collaboration and emphasis on sharing information with various entities over a large landscape.

WEAKNESSES

1. Collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match. The letter from the Village of Ruidoso does not verify the amount of the non-federal match provided.
2. The budget is unclear on whether the match is non-federal.
3. The New Mexico State Forestry letter does not identify the \$1,925 committed to the project as non-federal.
4. Andy Egan's letter from the New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute does not state that the match is non-federal.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Clarify the match does not include federal funds. Before funding the applicant needs to ensure that adequate non-federal match is available to support the project.
2. The application should include a better explanation and description of what kind of field data will be collected by the students/interns.
3. If not funded, we strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised application next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed. Particularly, the applicant needs to address: (1) how they will facilitate additional collaboration and connection among the land managers; (2) clarify the feasibility and sustainability of actually creating a degree program; and (3) clarify how the project will facilitate and actually promote land management decisions between agencies.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 06-12, Rev. 1
CATEGORY:	Planning
ORGANIZATION:	San Juan Soil & Water Conservation District
FOREST:	Cibola
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
EVALUATION SCORE:	43.00

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project could lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes and considers prescribed fire in the treatment area a desired outcome of the proposed planning process.
9. The application will preserve old and large trees.
10. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
11. The application has good budget detail and/or work plan, with very good budget narrative description identifying personnel and their duties and the breakdown of matching funds.
12. Applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations. The inclusion of objective 5 in the application to ensure the timing of activities proposed in the environmental assessment does not negatively impact birds and other wildlife is commendable.
13. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. Two-thirds of the average annual surface water for the Navajo nation is generated from this site. Restoration on this site will affect a lot of people.
15. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
16. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
17. Proponents are going to facilitate a New Mexico State Science Standards based curriculum.
18. The applicant is establishing permanent monitoring plots.
19. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent is encouraged to collaborate with the forest industry groups in the planning to help drive the proposed action.
2. A letter from the forest that would supervise the grant should be included.
3. The applicant should consider how they will move from heavy grazing to allowing enough fuel to carry a fire.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 07-12**
CATEGORY: Planning
ORGANIZATION: Forest Fitness
FOREST: Cibola
PROJECT TITLE: Multi-Agency, Restoration Planning near the community of La Madera, Sandia Mountains, New Mexico
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 250,853
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 62,702
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 313,555
EVALUATION SCORE: 44.18

STRENGTHS

1. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
2. The application includes strong letters of support.
3. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
4. The project includes a good youth component.
5. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
6. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
7. There is good coordination and strategic leveraging by the project to accomplish landscape scale goals and an all lands approach.
8. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
9. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
10. The application is very clear, concise, and well organized.
11. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
12. Due to the amount of people that this would affect and the economic base of the area and tourism with the ski area, the project is a high priority.
13. Good detailed maps including additional maps indicating where project work will occur.
14. There is a very good description of deliverables for each key personnel on the project.
15. Good description and table of the deliverables that will be accomplished by each partner and collaborator.
16. Since NEPA is not done, this project offers a good opportunity for collaboration.
17. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
18. The application will preserve old and large trees.
19. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
20. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

WEAKNESSES

1. La Madera community does not provide a letter of support and is not included as a project collaborator.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The applicant is encouraged to collaborate with La Madera and the San Antonio de las Huertas land grant.

2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
3. Given that the proposal references the fact that the planning area is inside one of the Cibola NF priority watersheds, in the planning process the applicant is encouraged to consider all priorities in the watershed restoration action plan.
4. The applicant is encouraged to collaborate with the East Mountain Interagency Fire Protection Association.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 08-12
CATEGORY:	Utilization
ORGANIZATION:	Roger Tucker, Inc.
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	Improved Utilization of Small Diameter Trees in Central New Mexico 2012
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 120,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 30,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 150,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	48.36

STRENGTHS

1. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities and the adaptability to change with the changing economy.
2. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
5. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
6. Applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses and recommendations.
7. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
8. The equipment being proposed is the right equipment for the right process.
9. Given the applicant's current production and experience, this project is part of a credible business plan and is therefore a high priority project.
10. There is an endorsement from the Cibola that commits to a continuing supply of restoration by-products.
11. The youth component includes exposure to equipment and utilization side of forest restoration identified last year.
12. The project effectively leverages funds; there is no request for salary or operating costs, as referenced last year and the match is a cash contribution (a loan he is securing).
13. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort which included the Bluewater, the Manzanos, and the Jemez Mountains.
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
15. The application will preserve old and large trees.
16. The project complements ongoing restoration treatments with a utilization plan.
17. NEPA is complete.

18. The project includes a good youth component.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In CFRP grant application 04-11, the Panel requested more detailed project maps indicating NEPA ready acres for removal. This recommendation is included again, since the proponent only identifies acres on the Bluewater record of decision. It is unclear how many acres are involved from this project.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 09-12
CATEGORY:	Utilization
ORGANIZATION:	New Mexico Forest Restoration Products
FOREST:	Cibola
PROJECT TITLE:	Increased Production and Processing of Small Diameter Trees in Socorro County
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	45.18

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates strong collaboration prior to submission of application.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete for the area that will supply the project.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts in an area that does not have a lot of utilization capacity.
8. The application will preserve old and large trees.
9. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
11. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
12. The project will maintain 8 jobs and create 8 new jobs for a total of 16 jobs within an economically depressed area of NM.
13. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
14. The project will contribute to the reduction of hazardous fuels which will reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire.
15. Implementation of this project will facilitate hazardous fuel reduction and the District's ability to reintroduce natural fire regimes.
16. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.

17. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration whereby an annual evaluation of monitoring data is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.
18. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address a high percentage of utilization of the generated by-product.
19. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
20. The applicant includes a letter from the UNM Small Business Development Center committing to assist in the business side of the operations and marketing.
21. The project builds on other CFRP projects such as the Alamo Navajo School Board and its development into producing value added material.

WEAKNESSES

1. With limited information of markets, values of products, or production, the panel has no way to evaluate the viability of the business application.
2. Application lacks a description or estimate of anticipated volume of mill products.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should ensure that any estimated program income is accounted for in the budget.
2. Include a legend in the map and identify the areas of treatment.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The application and budget do not address anticipated program income.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 10-12

CATEGORY:

Utilization

ORGANIZATION:

Tree New Mexico

FOREST:

Cibola

PROJECT TITLE:

Building a Sustainable Wood Program in the
Albuquerque Bosque

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$ 450,000

EVALUATION SCORE:

31.36

STRENGTHS

1. NEPA is complete.
2. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of forest restoration.
3. The project includes a good youth component.
4. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
5. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
6. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
7. The use of potential net revenues to fund future restoration in the bosque is commendable.

WEAKNESSES

1. Potential markets do not enumerate their purchases so it is difficult to justify that this project will generate \$191,000 per year and be sustainable indefinitely. There is no sales information to verify the projected income of \$191,000.
2. The proposal is partnering with City of Albuquerque Open Space Division that is not following U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service recommendations to survey and flag all active nests and avoid those nests during the summer breeding seasons.
3. The proposal lacks collaboration with other forest industries in the area that could have added efficiency to the processing the material.
4. On page 4, the proposal states that the wood that is not useable will be used for pellets, but there is no letter from a pellet manufacturer that will utilize the wood.
5. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
6. The Panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations were not adequately addressed. Last year's Panel recommended that the group collaborate with conservation groups on the protection of nesting bird habitat. The present proposal states that all work is subject to review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That is not collaboration. There is a long history of conflict between the City of Albuquerque and conservation groups with the involvement of US Fish and Wildlife Service law enforcement.
7. Last year's recommendation on clarification of market demand was not adequately addressed.
8. Without further clarification of existing equipment, how the requested winches would be used was unclear.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Application could be strengthened by collaboration with conservation groups and the Army Corp of Engineers in project design, implementation and monitoring. The Army Corp has a contract with Hawks Aloft to mark nests in the bosque and could be a useful collaborator.
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
3. There needs to be a well-documented business plan for the panel to better understand why a public entity should be in a mill business that would compete with other for profit entities.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The applicant should clarify program income in the SF-424A and clarify how it will be used.
2. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 11-12**
CATEGORY: Utilization
ORGANIZATION: TC Company
FOREST: Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE: Crossing Boundaries with Small Tree Utilization in the
 Jemez Mountains
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: 50.91

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
6. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
7. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities (30 plus years and demonstrated adaptability to a changing economy).
8. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
9. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
10. The project will create new jobs.
11. NEPA is complete.
12. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
13. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
14. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
15. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
16. The application will preserve old and large trees.
17. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort given that it will facilitate implementation of the Southwest Jemez Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program project (CFLRP).
18. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
19. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
20. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities (partners in the Southwest Jemez CFLRP).
21. Strength of this project is the pursuit of certification of products to reduce costs through a collaborative effort.
22. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
23. The project includes a good youth component.
24. The equipment being purchased is mobile and could reduce hauling costs.
25. The applicant has established a demonstrated long term supply of material.

26. The applicant has a demonstrated knowledge of the federal interest in equipment purchased with federal grant funds and referenced applicable CFRs.
27. The applicant includes letters that demonstrate commitment and enumerate the volume of markets, including cost per load.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Include a legend in the map and identify the areas of treatment.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. The proponent should include estimated program income in the budget.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 12-12
CATEGORY:	Utilization
ORGANIZATION:	New Mexico Biomass Technologies, LLC
FOREST:	Lincoln
PROJECT TITLE:	Utilization of Biomass Waste for Renewable Energy
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 120,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 30,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 150,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	44.10

STRENGTHS

1. The project will create new jobs.
2. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
3. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
4. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
5. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
6. The application is strengthened by having an objective related to the sustainability of forest biomass.
7. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
8. The application includes strong letters of support.
9. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
10. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
11. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
12. This project could reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
13. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
14. The project could add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
15. The project could lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
16. The project could increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
17. The application will preserve old and large trees.
18. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.

19. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
20. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
21. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
22. The application monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The application would be strengthened by adding estimates or quotes of equipment to be purchased.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. CFRP does not pay indirect overhead rates above 10 percent; however the project is charging a 42 percent indirect cost rate. The proponent needs to adjust the indirect overhead rate to NMSU to only 10 percent being paid by federal funds. The other 32 percent can be contributed as a portion of the non-federal match. The travel and personnel cost could be listed in the appropriate category rather than under indirect costs in the detailed budget narrative. There is no figure for indirect costs in Section F 22 of the 424a.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 13-12
CATEGORY:	Utilization
ORGANIZATION:	Restoration Technologies, LLC
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Demonstration Site Development of Zerosion, an Engineered Composite Biomass Erosion Control Material, Using Low Value Biomass Generated from Forest Treatment in Grant County
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 359,820
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 449,819
EVALUATION SCORE:	Eliminated from consideration due to missing letter from Soilutions.

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
7. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project could reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations

10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project could add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project could lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
15. The proposal investigates scale issue for use of biomass residuals in watershed restorations.
16. The proposal includes plans for distributing the intellectual properties and operating knowledge of a model biomass residual utilization business in rural forested communities.
17. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
18. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
19. There is a potential to use Zerosion on wildfire burned areas as an erosion control measure.

WEAKNESSES

1. The budget does not include clear unit costs. Travel, supplies, and other costs do not add up.
2. A letter from Soilutions that commits to their role in the implementation of this project (see detailed budget under G “Other costs”, and page 8 work plan table) was not included in the proposal; therefore this application is removed from consideration as noted in the RFA.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 14-12

CATEGORY:

Utilization

ORGANIZATION:

Silver Dollar Racing & Shavings

FOREST:

Carson

PROJECT TITLE:

Utilizing, Transporting & Adding Value to Small Diameter Trees or Timber (SDT)

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$ 450,000

EVALUATION SCORE:

45.64

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
4. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
5. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
6. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

7. The project would coordinate with the NM Statewide Resource Assessment to identify values at risk and priorities for forest restoration (see page 4).
8. The project is attempting to use small diameter wood projects for erosion control.
9. The application includes strong letters of support.
10. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
11. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
12. This project may reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
13. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
14. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
15. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. Using small diameter wood for a water filtration device is commendable.
18. Page 6 of the proposal provides a very good explanation of the production process and the end product.
19. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product (see page 6).
20. The expansion of transportation capacity in this region would lower transport costs and significantly improve the ability of the forest industry to get small diameter timber to commercial markets.
21. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES

1. Youth component lacks detail.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. If not funded, we strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised application next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. The application and budget do not address anticipated program income.
2. The proponent should include estimated program income in the budget.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 15-12

CATEGORY:

Implementation

ORGANIZATION:

Cordova Logging Inc.

FOREST:

Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE:

Seven Springs Hazardous Fuel Reduction Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$ 450,000

EVALUATION SCORE:

44.91

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations

2. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
8. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
12. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
14. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
18. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
19. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
20. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
21. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
22. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
23. The applicant does not anticipate any new road construction.
24. This project will add capacity in an area where landscape level treatments are planned to occur in the near future, specifically the Southwest Jemez CFLR.
25. The Forest Service District Ranger identified this project as a need for this area.
26. Project contains mitigation and monitoring to protect potential threatened and endangered species (currently a sensitive species).
27. On page 7, Cordova logging will conduct all thinning during winter months to protect nesting birds. That is commendable.
28. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
29. The application will preserve old and large trees.
30. The Forest Service Ranger District intends to offer tours of the project area to highlight the benefits of forest restoration.

WEAKNESSES

1. Page 5 of the proposal references “needy persons”, but does not specify where the remainder of the material is going.
2. Soil erosion rates cannot be estimated via rebar. Additional measurements are required to assess erosion rates.
3. Monitoring budget detail is insufficient. There is no cost breakout for/between the soil erosion and bird surveys.
4. The letters from the Quivera Coalition do not confirm the costs for their services that are in the budget.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The application should have clarified in the narrative that measurements will be taken both pre and post treatment.
2. Clarify whether the project will retain or create new jobs.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 16-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Santa Fe County Fire Dept.
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Reducing Wildfire Risk & Improving Forest Health in the Santa Fe County Wildland Urban Interface
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 359,112
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 81,951
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 441,063
EVALUATION SCORE:	Eliminated from consideration due to missing letters from La Cueva community, Santa Fe Community College and Santa Fe County Open Space.

STRENGTHS

1. NEPA is complete.
2. The project includes a good youth component.
3. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).

WEAKNESSES

1. The application is missing letters from the community of La Cueva, Santa Fe Community College, Santa Fe County Open Space that were listed in page 3, Collaborator table, budget summary, as collaborators.
2. Proponents did not demonstrate collaboration with conservation groups in design, implementation, and monitoring.
3. Collaborator / contractor letters do not verify match.
4. The utilization of materials outlined in the objectives on page 4 is vague.
5. Collaboration with forest industry is also vague.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Socio-economic indicators and desired outcomes need specific measures (eg. impacts to community such as changes in property values, assessments or insurance premiums). The insurance premium can be increased by as much as 40 percent if defensible space is created. These measures should be documented and the application is commended for considering this.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. Verify that all match is non-federal.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 17-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	WildEarth Guardians
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Los Indios Post-Fire Rehabilitation and Riparian Forest Restoration Implementation Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 240,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 60,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 300,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	35.90

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
10. The application will preserve old and large trees.
11. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
12. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and a description of how they will be measured.
13. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
14. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
15. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration whereby an annual evaluation of monitoring data will be used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.
18. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
19. The proposal includes the collection of local seeds as one source for replanting, which contributes to the conservation of the genetic patrimony of the forest and riparian areas.
20. The project implements treatments in a category 1 watershed.

WEAKNESSES

1. Maps did not clearly indicate where the planting and fencing would occur.
2. Proponents are introducing woody habitat in historical fire climax grasslands.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Verify that the match is non-federal. On page 14, there is potential conflict with the Santa Clara project on Turkey Creek, CFRP 19-12, although this project states that the work on Turkey Creek is privately funded.
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird

- habitat). Specifically, on Page 18, reference is made to contour felling during the summer of 2014, which is about when the wood peckers would start to move into these trees.
3. Projects that include riparian proposals should include soils data and a statement concerning species that were historically present.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 18-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	NorthEastern Contractors, LLC
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Multi-Jurisdictional, Watershed Scale Restoration in Barbero Canyon, Rowe Mesa, NM
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	44.40

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The application will preserve old and large trees.
14. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
18. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
19. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
20. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
21. Applicant has adequately addressed the prior weaknesses & recommendations.
22. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
23. The project will create new jobs.
24. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
25. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

26. The monitoring plan was refreshingly complete including everything that needs to be done in a fire climax community.
27. The cost per acre is lower than most CFRP projects.

WEAKNESSES

1. The letter from the NM Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute indicates travel and technical assistance paid by the project, but this is not reflected in the included budget (\$1,200 total).

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
2. On page 2-3 project history, the applicant mentions past treatments that occurred in the vicinity of the project. It would have been useful to see a map indicating those past treatments.
3. Prior to purchasing the processor the applicant should request a demonstration from the seller to verify that the processor can split piñon.
4. School collaborators should mention their utilization role.
5. Quotes or comparable prices of equipment to be purchased with CFRP funds should be provided in the application.
6. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and the land managers to agree/commit in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).
2. The application and budget do not address anticipated program income.
3. Direct costs are identified in the budget under the indirect cost category. There are no indirect charges in the 424a; but there are in the detailed budget.

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 19-12

CATEGORY:

Implementation

ORGANIZATION:

Pueblo of Santa Clara

FOREST:

Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE:

Collaborative Post Fire Restoration in Santa Clara Canyon

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$ 450,000

EVALUATION SCORE:

38.55

STRENGTHS

1. Contour felling is a cost effective activity in this case.
2. The proposal includes efforts to conserve the genetic patrimony of the forest through the collection of seed to be used to provide seedlings for future reforestation efforts

3. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
4. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
5. The application includes strong letters of support.
6. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component
8. The project will create new jobs.
9. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
10. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
11. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
12. NEPA is complete.
13. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
14. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and a description of how they will be measured.
18. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
19. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments. It is noted that a former CFRP project 12-02 protected a portion of the Santa Clara Pueblo from the Las Conchas fire.

WEAKNESSES

1. No standard operating procedures or designs to contain the discharge for these types of slopes. Without a discharge evaluation and study, specific to current conditions on the proposed treatment site, the panel has no way to evaluate the efficacy of the proposed treatments.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Explain how safety concerns will be addressed after the second year of the project when post burn forest conditions may prevent work on the proposed treatments due to unsafe working conditions.
2. Because the matter of federal funds is complex with respect to tribes, the overlap between this proposal, the FEMA grant mentioned in the proposal, the Corps of Engineers grant and the ongoing Forest Service grants needs to be clarified.
3. At 25 percent of the direct costs for personnel, project oversight and coordination costs seem excessive. There may be alternative match possibilities that could be pursued.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. Project should ensure that vehicle lease costs and mileage cost do not result in double billing to federal funds.
2. The proponent should ensure that any estimated program income is accounted for in the budget.

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 20-12**
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Griegos Logging, LLC
FOREST: Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE: Las Vegas (Gallinas) Municipal Watershed WUI Fuels Reduction Project Phase 2
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration based on missing letter from Clarence Montoya.

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project will create new jobs.

WEAKNESSES

1. Eliminated from consideration because a letter of support was not included from Clarence Montoya (per page 2 of RFA) who is listed on page 3 of the detailed budget narrative of the application as a contractor for grant administration at the rate of \$6,000 per year.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proposal would benefit from supplying additional information on the proposed purchase such as what the equipment will be used for or a specific price quote on the equipment

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 21-12**
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Southwest Wood Products & Thinning
FOREST: Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE: Gallinas Watershed Implementation Project (Calf Canyon WUI)
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: 47.25

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
13. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and a descriptions of how they will be measured.
14. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
15. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The application will preserve old and large trees.
18. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
19. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
20. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
21. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
22. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
23. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
24. This proposal includes extensive collaboration with universities and other education institutions
25. The proposal includes a very good map identifying the previous and proposed treatment areas.
26. The proponent is commended for including information on sampling design and monitoring (page 6 of the narrative).

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The match in the Tierra Y Montes Letter seems high for the activity (\$82/hr).
2. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).
3. The contractual amount in the Adelente letter does not match the budget and the roles identified don't match the project partner matrix (Table 1).

4. The proponent should ensure that any estimated program income is accounted for in the budget.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 22-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Padilla Logging
FOREST:	Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE:	Diego/Chaparral Wild Land Urban Interface Treatment Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	44.30

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project will reduce fire risk in community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts. The purchase of a Feller Buncher is commendable.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
12. The application will preserve old and large trees.
13. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
14. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
15. The project includes an adaptive approach to restoration in an annual evaluation of monitoring data which is used to collaboratively refine prescriptions.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
18. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
19. The letter from the District Ranger endorses the proposed project and commits to bringing fire back to the project area.
20. The proponent is to be commended for the break out of fringe benefits by classification instead of generalizing across all personnel.
21. This project will not create new roads.
22. The applicant should be commended for their commitment to safety and training.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The proponent should ensure that estimated program income is in the budget.
2. Provide clarification on the rate of the YCC crew and supervisor. Does the \$491 represent all of the crew or just the supervisor?

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 23-12

CATEGORY:

Implementation

ORGANIZATION:

Sierra Soil & Water Conservation District

FOREST:

Gila

PROJECT TITLE:

Implementation of Fuel Reduction and Bosque Restoration Next to Percha Dam Recreation Site

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 143,439 (from the 424)

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 28,692

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$ 172,131 (from the 424)

EVALUATION SCORE:

36.01

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
9. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
10. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and descriptions of how they will be measured.
11. The project will create new jobs.
12. NEPA is complete.
13. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
14. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
15. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
16. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
17. The avoidance of vegetation disturbing work during the nesting season for birds is commendable.

WEAKNESSES

1. The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) letter of support does not commit to their specific role in of finalizing the prescription, selecting plantings and monitoring.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A letter from the Forest that would administer the grant should be included.
2. For consistency in the proposal, the proponent should make sure that there are 30 NEPA approved acres available for treatment as opposed to 24 (page 7).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The budget on the 424 does not match the detailed budget.
2. The project appears to be under matched using the numbers on the 424 (17 percent versus the required 20 percent). The detailed budget shows a non-federal match of around 17 percent.
3. The proponent should ensure that estimated program income is included in the budget.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 24-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Gila Wood Products, LLC
FOREST:	Gila
PROJECT TITLE:	Gila Wood Products & Kellar Logging Collaborative Restoration Thinning and Market Fulfillment Partnership
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 359,881
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 89,979
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 449,860
EVALUATION SCORE:	47.95

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application includes strong letters of support.
3. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
6. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will create new jobs.
13. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
14. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
15. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.

16. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
17. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
18. The application will preserve old and large trees.
19. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
20. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
21. The proponent collectively identifies the objectives and outcomes (pages 4 and 5).
22. Industry collaborators with different equipment are cooperating to complete different phases of the project.

WEAKNESSES

1. Budget does not include clear unit costs.
2. The markets for the proposed business expansion are not clearly identified, but these markets often can't be clearly identified for these products because they are generally a spot market.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. The proponent should ensure estimated program income is included in the budget.
2. Proponent should include quotes for potential equipment to be purchased

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 25-12

CATEGORY:

Implementation

ORGANIZATION:

Gila Tree Thinners

FOREST:

Gila

PROJECT TITLE:

Expanding a Traditionally Non-Commercial Firewood Market of Sustainably Harvested Pinyon from the Burro Mountain Homestead WUI Restoration Project

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$ 450,000

EVALUATION SCORE:

44.66

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project includes a good youth component.
6. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations

7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
12. The project will create new jobs.
13. The application will preserve old and large trees.
14. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially address 100 percent utilization of the generated by-product.
18. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and descriptions of how they will be measured.
19. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
20. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
21. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
22. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
23. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
24. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
25. Good identification of a variety of markets and outlets for utilization of restoration by-products supported by letters discussing prices, quantity and quality, in particular the mix of piñon and other species.
26. Regular access and review of monitoring data remotely will help to ensure accuracy and sharing with the full team.
27. Material from the project covers transportation costs at a rate of \$100 per 2-cord load.

WEAKNESSES

1. No commitment to monitoring in some of the collaborator letters such as: Southwest Tree Solutions, Center for Biological Diversity, BMH and adjacent landowners. These collaborators are identified in page 4 of the collaborators table as having a role in monitoring.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
2. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and the land managers to agree/commit in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).
2. The proponent should ensure that estimated program income is included in the budget.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 26-12
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Alfonso Chacon Jr.
FOREST: Carson
PROJECT TITLE: Healthy Forests Healthy Communities in Vallecitos
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: 47.05

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
13. The application will preserve old and large trees.
14. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
18. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
19. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
20. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
21. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
22. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
23. The project will create new jobs.
24. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes by including grazing permittees in the collaborative group and commitments to range management that will facilitate prescribed fire.
25. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
26. The proponent is committed to the safety of the Forest workers.
27. The proponent broke out the fringe costs from workmen's compensation itemized rates. The rates for chainsaw operators and other laborers were broken out in the budget showing the different fringe rates for the different categories of workers.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations

28. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
29. This business will continue to strive and utilize the machinery they purchased even if they do not received another CFRP grant.
30. Good quality maps.

WEAKNESSES

1. Panel’s prior recommendation number 3 was not adequately addressed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The application would be strengthened by adding estimates or quotes of equipment to be purchased.
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
3. Proponent should ensure that the cost of safety training through the Forest Worker Safety Certification Program is adequately budgeted.
4. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and the land managers to agree/commit in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. Collaborator / contractor letters do not verify costs. The Forest Guild’s letter has a total amount of \$25,020 over three years but the detailed budget shows the Forest Guild receiving \$23,625.
2. At the top of page 2 of the budget narrative, the Wild Earth Guardians should be removed from the category of match.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 27-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Implementation of Forest Restoration within Maquinitas Analysis Area
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 359,468
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 89,999
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 449,467
EVALUATION SCORE:	47.19

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.

6. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a very good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
13. The application will preserve old and large trees.
14. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
16. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
17. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
18. The project will create up to 24 new jobs will over a 3-year period.
19. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
20. The application includes collaborator interest forms.
21. Good detailed maps are provided.
22. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
23. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat (firewood production).
24. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
25. The Forest Service District Ranger commits to fire ignitions.
26. The project adds trained forest worker capacity to the area.
27. The proponent is committed to forest worker safety and training as reflected in the budget.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
2. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and the land managers to get a commitment in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 28-12

CATEGORY:

Implementation

ORGANIZATION:

Forest Guild

FOREST:

Carson

PROJECT TITLE:

Ecosystem Process Restoration through Prescribed Fire
Capacity Building in Black Lake

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 137,469

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 34,367

TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 171,836
EVALUATION SCORE: 52.44

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
4. NEPA is complete.
5. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
6. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes and includes a section in the proposal on the need for rest as well as a letter from the permittees committing to rest. (Letter from Jose and Mark Torres commits to a one year rest after the burn.)
7. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
8. The application includes strong letters of support.
9. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
10. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
11. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
12. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
13. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
14. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
15. The application will preserve old and large trees.
16. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
17. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and descriptions of how they will be measured.
18. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
19. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
20. The involvement of Zander Evans, who has been working on the management implications mixed conifer stand ecology, will lead to better management insights.
21. This is an innovative project to bring local and national resources to focus in an area of need in a State without the legal infrastructure for implementing prescribed burning on nonfederal lands.
22. The application is a very good collaborative effort, bringing together private, county, federal, state and tribal resources in order to implement the proposed project. Recognition of the Wyden Authority facilitates cross-agency collaboration.
23. As indicated by the New Mexico Environment Department Air Quality Bureau letter, the burn plan manages smoke impacts.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

1. There is a discrepancy between Herman Vigil inkind letter (\$400) and the budget on page 3 (\$600) for staging.

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 29-12 Rev 1.
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Joe Gurule & Son
FOREST: Carson
PROJECT TITLE: Forest Restoration & Education in the Aqua Caballos Vallacitos Sustained Yield Unit
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: 41.45

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
7. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
8. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
9. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and how they will be measured.
10. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
11. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
12. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
13. The project includes a good youth component.
14. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project will create new jobs.
17. The proposal includes an elementary education component that is sponsored by Los Alamos National Laboratory.
18. The letter of endorsement from the Forest Service District Ranger emphasized the project's importance to prescribed burning in that area.

WEAKNESSES

1. Panel's prior weaknesses and recommendations are not adequately addressed, specifically recommendations numbers 2 and 3. It is unclear what equipment the proponent intends to purchase.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The application would be strengthened by adding estimates or quotes of equipment to be purchased.
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

3. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and land managers to get a commitment in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The letter of support from Rocky Mountain Ecology commits to \$22,651.70, but the detailed budget shows their commitment as \$ 23,100.

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 30-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	La Alba, LLC
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Implementation: Mesa Juan Domingo Pinion/ Juniper Forest Restoration and Fuel Reduction in the Canjilon WUI
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	45.45

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
9. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information. There is a good discussion of the current restoration science for pinyon-juniper ecosystems.
10. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
11. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
13. The application will preserve old and large trees.
14. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
18. This application includes a diverse array of products that could potentially utilize 100 percent of the generated by-product.
19. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and a description of how they will be measured.
20. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
21. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.

22. The application includes collaborator interest forms.
23. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (upper Chama).
24. The project will create new jobs.
25. The application monitoring goes beyond the core CFRP ecological indicators.
26. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes and includes letters of commitment from permittees.
27. The block that they are cutting complements the block planned for cutting in CFRP 31.
28. The project would provide outreach and contribute to local communities, youth groups and organizations.
29. Good detailed maps are provided.
30. The proponent includes a good habitat improvement component by placing 1/10 acre of vegetation clump areas (VCA's) for wildlife and range.
31. The proponent incorporates a reseeding program at a rate of 13 lbs. of seed per acre.
32. The letter of endorsement from the Forest Service District Ranger commits to conducting a follow up prescribed burn after the restoration treatment is complete.
33. Ranger letter commits strongly to proposal activities and working with new contractors.
34. The proponents' qualifications show that they are knowledgeable of treatments and related issues.
35. Good safety plan including addressing emergencies.

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. If this is funded ensure that equipment purchased is outfitted for forestry use.
2. Consider alternative seed mixes that are more appropriate for restoration than reclamation.
3. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and land managers to get a commitment in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).
4. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activities to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
5. Consider 319 H funding in addition to CFRP funds to prevent sedimentation in creek.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 31-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Chimayo Conservation Corps
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Implementation: Chimayo Conservation Corps Developing Local Capacity to Restore Forest Health
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	45.45

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates strong collaboration has occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The project will increase the use of wildland fire use and/or prescribed fire.
12. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators that describe how they will be measured.
13. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
14. The project will create new jobs.
15. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
16. The application will preserve old and large trees.
17. Project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.
18. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
19. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
20. Includes collaborator interest forms.
21. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
22. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
23. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
24. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
25. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
26. The proponent is working with 3 public land agencies: Forest Service, BLM, and State Land Office.
27. The block that they are cutting complements the block planned for cutting in CFRP 30.
28. The letter of endorsement from the Forest Service District Ranger commits to implement prescribed burning to treat fuels.
29. Proposal includes information on surface biomass in tons per acre, which is important in predicting fire behavior.
30. The executive summary follows the format in the RFA.

WEAKNESSES

31. Page 48 and 50 - letters of collaboration are not signed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).

2. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and land managers to get a commitment in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).
3. The Letter of Endorsement from the Ranger should include a statement on the applicant's past performance.
4. Include dated email letters of commitment from Hammerstone Archeological Services and La Alba, LLC for verification. The letters from them in the application were dated but not signed (page 48 and page 50).

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 32-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Jaramillo & Sons Forest Products
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Implementation: Quality Environmental and Economic Sustainability Projects-Phase II
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 216,541
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 54,134
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 270,675
EVALUATION SCORE:	43.64

STRENGTHS

1. It is commendable that the applicant and the Carson National Forest are working toward a landscape treatment area and leveraging funding sources outside the CFRP. Significant project work has been accomplished in a seven year period.
2. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
3. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
4. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
5. The application includes strong letters of support.
6. NEPA is complete.
7. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
8. The project includes a good youth component.
9. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
10. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
11. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
12. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
13. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
14. The application will preserve old and large trees.
15. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
16. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
17. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
18. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
19. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.

20. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).
21. The project will create new jobs.
22. The letter of endorsement from the Forest Service District Ranger commits to reintroducing fire through the use of prescribed fire. Those prescribed fires would follow up on a series of CFRP projects that together represent a landscape.
23. The project has a road management plan including a closure following the project.

WEAKNESSES

1. The unit cost of the project coordinator to travel to meetings is vague.
2. The analysis of last year's weaknesses and recommendations made no mention of recommendation 12 to consider the seasonality of ground disturbing work.
3. The description or estimate of volume by product is a broad range. It would have been better to present that information as an average.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and the land managers to agree/commit in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
3. Proponent should work with the Forest Service to correct the map indicating the treatment acres for 2 years rather than 3 years as stated.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).

PROJECT NUMBER:

CFRP 33-12

CATEGORY:

Implementation

ORGANIZATION:

County of Colfax

FOREST:

Carson

PROJECT TITLE:

Raton Post-Wildfire Restoration

FUNDING REQUESTED:

\$ 360,000

MATCHING FUNDS:

\$ 90,000

TOTAL BUDGET:

\$ 450,000

EVALUATION SCORE:

The Panel eliminated this application from consideration because the proposed activities were not among those analyzed and disclosed in the NEPA document that was included in the application.

STRENGTHS

WEAKNESSES

1. Page 4 and 5 of the application states that an objective of the project is to update the NEPA documentation prior to on the ground restoration activities.

2. The attached decision memo does not support the activities proposed in the project and the proponent agreed that a new NEPA decision is needed. The activities in this application are not among those analyzed and disclosed in the NEPA document. After public scoping, it is not a guarantee that the proposed treatments for this proposal will still be valid. The CFRP Request for Applications requires a NEPA document be included for implementation projects (page 8 and 9, CFRP 2012 RFA).

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The panel recommends the applicant reapply for an implementation grant after completion of NEPA.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 34-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Kuykendall & Sons Sawmill
FOREST:	Carson
PROJECT TITLE:	Implementation: Maquinita Ecosystem Health Project
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE:	50.45

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. NEPA is complete.
6. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
7. The project includes a good youth component.
8. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
9. The project will add significant capacity to restoration efforts.
10. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
11. The project will increase the use of wildland fire and/or prescribed fire.
12. The project blends a restoration treatment with a utilization plan.
13. The project integrates treatment with existing utilization industries in the area.
14. The project supplies materials for biomass-to-heat or other bio-energy efforts.
15. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and descriptions of how they will be measured.
16. The proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities. This business has existed for three generations and they have been adapting to economic changes for over 80 years.
17. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
18. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.

Strengths, Weaknesses, and Recommendations

19. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.
20. The application offers an opportunity to address the interaction between grazing and the re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
21. The letter of endorsement from the Forest Service District Ranger commits to implementing post treatment prescribed burns and to working with his range staff and permittees to adjust grazing as needed for the successful reintroduction of prescribed fire.
22. The applicant would address program income by including product sales as part of their non-federal match.
23. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
24. The project implements a Community Wildfire Protection Plan.
25. The project will create new jobs.
26. The monitoring plan has good detail on what will be accomplished (pre and post monitoring) and the density of their stand exams is admirable.
27. The proponent is committed through the budget to forest worker safety.
28. Good detailed maps are provided.
29. Use of a winch rather than a grapple as an attachment to the skidder is commendable since it creates less ground disturbance.
30. The application includes good documentation of previous grant accomplishments, including a copy of the previous CFRP multiparty monitoring report (Red Mesa).

WEAKNESSES

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
2. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and land managers to agree/commit in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).
3. Consider purchasing a six way wedge for the firewood processor to prevent having to run the wood through the processor twice.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER:	CFRP 35-12
CATEGORY:	Implementation
ORGANIZATION:	Turkey Creek Forestry Service, Inc.
FOREST:	Lincoln
PROJECT TITLE:	Implementation of Pre-Commercial Thinning and Fuels Reduction in Bear Canyon
FUNDING REQUESTED:	\$ 352,381
MATCHING FUNDS:	\$ 88,100
TOTAL BUDGET:	\$ 440,481
EVALUATION SCORE:	39.91

STRENGTHS

1. The application includes strong letters of support.

2. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
3. NEPA is complete.
4. The project will reduce fire risk in a community on the *New Mexico Communities at Risk* List.
5. This project will reduce the risk of high-intensity wildfire.
6. The project will lead to re-establishment of natural fire regimes.
7. The application will preserve old and large trees.
8. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
9. The proponents demonstrate the vertical integration (proponent is able to harvest, process and market the wood with several different companies accomplishing these tasks) required in this area of the state.
10. The project is leveraging this treatment with prescribed burning funded by the Habitat Stamp program.
11. It is good to see that the proposal includes the silvicultural prescription guidelines.
12. The project demonstrates adaptability on its treatment to account for Mexican Spotted Owl Protected Area Centers (PACs) in the project area.
13. The level of collaboration on this project from the Forest Service Ranger District is commendable.

WEAKNESSES

1. The Panel is pleased to see applications from the Lincoln, but this application is missing collaboration with some important entities working in forestry in the area such as Otero County, Otero County Working Group and NM State Forestry. The project does not demonstrate the depth and breadth of collaboration that the Panel would like to see in this area.
2. The project does not include a socio-economic component in either the goals or the monitoring plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Include a better legend for the map describing the project acres to be treated. In the legend of the map explain what the 623 total acres identify.
2. The proponent should work with conservation groups to develop plans for the timing of ground disturbing activity to account for wildlife needs (e.g., to protect nesting bird habitat).
3. The proposal would be strengthened if the proponent worked with grazing permittees and land managers to agree to and commit in writing to a rest period following treatment (both burning and other treatments where grass needs to recover).
4. If not funded, we strongly encourage the applicant to resubmit a revised application next year with the recommendations and weaknesses addressed.

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

1. The applicant addressed program income in their letter of support, but it is not included in the 424a or detailed budget.
2. Supplies are included in the budget line for equipment (or vice versa).

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 36-12
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Village of Ruidoso
FOREST: Lincoln
PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of Bog Springs Wetlands Restoration
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 117,439
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 29,860
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 147,299
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration due to missing letter from Hammerstone Archaeological

STRENGTHS

WEAKNESSES

1. Project is eliminated because it is missing a letter of commitment from Hammerstone Archaeological, who is listed in page 2 of the budget narrative, as performing the archaeological survey for \$2,500.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS:

PROJECT NUMBER: CFRP 37-12
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: South Central Mountains Resource Conservation and Development Council
FOREST: Lincoln
PROJECT TITLE: White Fire Restoration & Education Implementation CFRP Proposal
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 192,289
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 87,450
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 241,903
EVALUATION SCORE: 39.61

STRENGTHS

1. The project includes a diverse and balanced group of partners.
2. The application demonstrates that strong collaboration occurred prior to submission.
3. The application includes strong letters of support.
4. The application includes strong letters of support from collaborators that commit to matching funds, roles, and responsibilities as described in the application.
5. Application demonstrates a commitment to a longer-term comprehensive program of collaborative forest restoration.
6. The project includes a good youth component.
7. The project incorporates current scientific restoration information.
8. The application will preserve old and large trees.
9. The project is part of an integrated landscape restoration effort.

10. The application includes a detailed monitoring plan, with indicators and descriptions of how they will be measured.
11. This proponent has extensive expertise in the proposed activities.
12. Good budget detail and/or work plan.
13. The application is clear, concise, and well organized.
14. Project includes cross-jurisdictional activities.
15. The project builds on past CFRP accomplishments.

WEAKNESSES

1. The treatment areas are unclear in the maps provided.
2. Application does not state that safety of operators / operations will be assured.

RECOMMENDATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE OBSERVATIONS

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 38-12**
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: The Wellness Coalition
FOREST: Gila
PROJECT TITLE: The Wellness Coalition/Youth Conservation Corps Forest Restoration Project (Resubmitted)
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration due to missing NEPA decision document.

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 39-12**
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Los Amigos de Valles Caldera
FOREST: Santa Fe
PROJECT TITLE: Ponderosa Pine and Xeric Mixed Conifer Restoration on the Valles Caldera National Preserve
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 330,947
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 82,739
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 413,686
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration due to missing signature and date on SF424

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 40-12**
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Ohkay Owingeh
FOREST: Santa Fe

PROJECT TITLE: Sustainable Riparian Forest Restoration at Ohkay Owingeh, Nambe Pueblo, and Orilla Verde Recreation Area
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 359,839
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 89,960
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 449,799
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration due to missing date on SF 424.

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 41-12**
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: A & A Forestry
FOREST: Gila
PROJECT TITLE: Restoration of Pronghorn Habitat in Moraga Canyon
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 120,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 30,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 150,000
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration due to missing NEPA decision document.

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 42-12**
CATEGORY: Utilization
ORGANIZATION: Ellinger Logger
FOREST: Gila
PROJECT TITLE: Utilization: La Luz Sort Yard & Small Log Processing Center
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration due to missing letter of commitment from Mark Hare.

PROJECT NUMBER: **CFRP 43-12**
CATEGORY: Implementation
ORGANIZATION: Mt. Taylor Machine, LLC
FOREST: Gila
PROJECT TITLE: Implementation of Forest Restoration in the Cibola
FUNDING REQUESTED: \$ 360,000
MATCHING FUNDS: \$ 90,000
TOTAL BUDGET: \$ 450,000
EVALUATION SCORE: Eliminated from consideration due to missing letters from NMFIA, NM Recycling Coalition and City of Grants

Recommendations for Improving the RFA and the Panel Evaluation Process

Improvements to Request for Applications

- Collaborator letters could also include collaborator interest forms. Letters of commitment should be signed and dated. Instructions on who should provide letters of commitment should be clarified. Those partners receiving federal funds or providing non-federal match should provide letters of commitment. Clarify that letters of commitment are not needed from those only involved in proposal development, but are needed from those with specific roles in the project, even if they are not listed as partners. Letters of commitment are required from all project partners (i.e., all those individuals or entities with specific roles in implementation in the budget or providing non-federal match)
- Fort Sill Apache should be included on the CFRP List of tribes to contact. Review/update that list. Consider requiring that the letter to the Governors of the Pueblos include a phone number and a date requesting a turnaround time for the response.
- Quotes or comparable prices of equipment to be purchased with CFRP funds should be provided in the application.
- Include information on past performance in endorsement letters from the Forest Service, even if it is on another district, or obtain a letter with that information from another agency (page 12 of Request for Applications (RFA)). The applicant should be responsible for getting a letter for prior grants.
- Revise RFA to include requirement of signature (electronic or otherwise)
- Discuss/resolve the issue of non-federal land requirements for NEPA document. Check Request for Applications (RFA) language for non-federal NEPA.
- Language addressing the need to collaborate with permittees and land managers regarding rest periods from grazing following treatment should be included in sample documents.
- Consider lowering number of planning and increasing utilization proposals able to be funded.
- NEPA documents should support the proposed treatments in the areas proposed for treatment.
- The executive summaries and budget narratives need to express the criticality of the site and describe why it is critical to treat that particular site in an implementation project. Anything the applicant can do to convey to the Panel why it is a critical site would improve the RFA.

Improvements to the Evaluation Process

- Limit input from the Designated Federal Official and Forest Service staff to statements of fact and guidance.
- Invoke more often the weakness on not stating clearly what the project would accomplish. Titles for planning and implementation need to be more descriptive in that regard and less generic.
- Consider submitting grant applications electronically.
- Clean up the boilerplate list of strengths, weaknesses and recommendations.

Appendix A. Technical Advisory Panel Bylaws

April 23, 2012

Section I: Purpose:

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

Section II: Authority:

The Secretary of Agriculture first established the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel as a Federal Advisory Committee on July 12, 2001 pursuant to Section 606 of the Community Forest Restoration Act Of 2000 (Pub. L. No. 106-393) (the Act), which directs the Secretary to convene a technical advisory panel to evaluate proposals that will receive funding through the Collaborative Forest Restoration Program. The Secretary has renewed the Federal Advisory Act (FACA) charter every 2 years since 2001. The Panel is subject to the FACA, the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and the Government in the Sunshine Act (GISA).

Section III: Membership Selection and Appointment:

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

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

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

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

The Secretary of Agriculture shall appoint a Designated Federal Official (DFO) under sections 10 (e) and (f) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, 5 U.S.C. App. The Panel will select a Chairperson from among their members.

Section IV: Meeting Procedures:

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

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

A. Agenda: The Designated Federal Official/Chairman will approve the proposed agenda for each meeting and distributed it to panel members prior to each meeting. An outline of the agenda will be published with a notice of the meeting in the Federal Register at least 15 days prior to the meeting. CFRP project proposals will be distributed to panel members for review at least 6 weeks prior to the panel meeting. Any member of the panel may submit additional agenda items to the Designated Federal Official prior to the meeting if they are related to proposal evaluation. Members of the public may submit items for consideration that are related to proposal evaluation by sending them to the Designated Federal Official prior to the meeting.

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

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

Members of the public may attend any meeting or portion of a meeting and, at the determination of the Chairman, offer written comment at such meeting. Public comment periods will be scheduled and limited to three minutes per person. The panel will not consider new information that was required by the Request for Applications (RFA) if it constitutes a substantial change to the original proposal. The panel may consider information provided in response to a request for clarification or if it is a factual correction.

Section V: Role of Panel Members:

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

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

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

If a Panel Member or any member of their immediate family, or organization employing them, will directly or financially benefit from a CFRP grant proposal being evaluated, or if a Panel Member was directly involved in the development of the proposal, that Panel member **shall leave the meeting room during the discussion of that proposal and recuse themselves from the Panel's decision** to avoid a conflict of interest. Panel members may answer questions from grant

applicants regarding the eligibility and appropriateness of project proposal ideas and still engage in the discussion and decision on a proposal.

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

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

Section VI: Process for Developing Recommendations

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

Section VI: Expenses and Reimbursement

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

Appendix B. April 23-27, 2012, Meeting Participants

Interest

State Natural Resources Official
Federal Land Management Agency
Federal Land Management Agency
Independent Scientist
Independent Scientist

Conservation
Conservation
Conservation
Local Community
Commodity
Commodity and Chairman
Asst. Designated Federal Officer

Name, Organization

Mike Matush, NMED-Surface Water Quality Bureau
Danny Gomez, USDI Bureau of Indian Affairs
Timothy Pohlman, USDA Forest Service
Robert Berrens, PhD, University of New Mexico
Lawrence Vincent, PhD, UNM-Taos Academy of
Science and Environmental Studies
Bryan Bird, Wild Earth Guardians
Thomas Jervis, Audubon New Mexico
John Olivas, NM Wilderness Alliance
Dick Cooke, Village of Ruidoso
Daniel Barrone, Olguns, Inc.
Brent Racher, Restoration Solutions, LLC.
Walter Dunn, USDA Forest Service, Southwestern
Region

Appendix C: Criteria Scores for Applications by Category Sorted Highest to Lowest

2012 CFRP Panel Scores by Criteria: Planning

Note: Criteria 3 was a yes/no question not scored with points

LTM - Long Term Management

Proposal #	1	2	3*	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Subtotal	Effect on LTM*	Final Score
CFRP 03-12	3.25	3.13		3.25	3.88	4.00	3.50	2.75	4.88	4.13	4.00	3.25	4.00	44.00	3.88	47.88
CFRP 07-12	3.18	2.64		1.55	3.00	3.36	4.00	3.18	3.27	3.82	4.18	4.36	3.91	40.45	3.73	44.18
CFRP 06-12	3.18	3.09		2.27	3.64	3.55	3.45	3.00	3.55	3.91	2.82	4.09	3.73	40.27	2.73	43.00
CFRP 01-12	3.00	2.89		2.56	4.00	4.00	3.11	2.11	2.89	3.67	4.44	3.22	3.78	39.67	3.11	42.78
CFRP 02-12	2.78	2.67		2.22	3.89	2.89	3.11	2.22	3.00	3.67	3.67	3.22	2.67	36.00	2.22	38.22
CFRP 05-12	1.90	1.90		1.40	3.70	2.30	2.70	1.60	3.50	2.90	3.80	3.50	2.50	31.70	2.20	33.90

2012 CFRP Panel Scores by Criteria: Utilization

Note: Criteria 3 was a yes/no question not scored with points.

LTM - Long Term Management

Project #	1	2	3*	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Subtotal	Effect on LTM**	Final Score
CFRP 11-12	3.73	3.18		4.64	4.09	3.45	3.18	3.64	4.00	4.82	4.27	3.82	4.27	47.09	3.82	50.91
CFRP 08-12	3.64	3.00		4.73	3.55	2.91	3.09	3.73	3.73	4.55	3.82	3.55	4.27	44.55	3.82	48.36
CFRP 14-12	3.18	3.00		4.45	3.45	3.18	3.18	3.36	3.09	4.45	3.73	3.36	3.73	42.18	3.45	45.64
CFRP 09-12	3.36	2.91		4.09	3.55	3.18	2.82	3.45	3.91	3.82	3.55	3.18	3.82	41.64	3.55	45.18
CFRP 12-12	2.80	2.40		4.30	3.40	3.20	3.60	3.60	3.40	3.70	3.60	3.80	3.80	41.60	2.50	44.10
CFRP 10-12	2.45	2.09		2.55	1.82	2.64	2.73	2.55	3.09	2.27	2.27	2.82	2.64	29.91	1.45	31.36

2012 CFRP Panel Scores: Implementation

Note: Criteria 3 was a yes/no question not scored with points.

LTM - Long Term Management

Project #	1	2	3*	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Sub-total	Effect on LTM**	Final Score
CFRP 28-12	4.00	4.40		3.10	4.30	4.30	4.00	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.20	4.40	4.20	48.80	3.64	52.44
CFRP 34-12	3.91	3.91		4.00	4.00	4.27	3.64	3.82	3.64	4.55	3.36	3.36	4.09	46.55	3.91	50.45
CFRP 24-12	3.50	3.20		4.30	4.00	3.20	3.40	3.90	3.50	4.50	3.40	3.50	4.00	44.40	3.55	47.95
CFRP 21-12	3.50	3.00		3.40	3.50	3.80	3.50	3.90	3.70	4.30	3.30	4.10	3.70	43.70	3.55	47.25
CFRP 27-12	3.70	3.40		2.50	3.40	4.30	3.40	4.10	4.50	4.40	3.30	3.30	3.80	44.10	3.09	47.19
CFRP 26-12	3.60	3.30		3.60	3.90	3.50	3.40	3.60	3.50	4.30	3.50	3.50	3.80	43.50	3.55	47.05
CFRP 30-12	3.36	3.73		3.09	3.91	3.73	3.64	3.64	3.55	3.18	3.27	3.64	3.45	42.18	3.27	45.45
CFRP 31-12	3.27	3.36		2.82	3.82	3.73	3.36	3.45	4.00	3.73	3.73	3.36	3.64	42.27	3.18	45.45
CFRP 15-12	3.45	3.18		3.18	3.64	3.55	3.45	3.64	3.36	3.91	3.00	4.18	3.00	41.55	3.36	44.91
CFRP 25-12	3.50	3.20		3.50	3.60	3.60	3.10	3.30	3.30	4.10	3.30	3.30	3.50	41.30	3.36	44.66
CFRP 18-12	3.60	3.80		2.50	3.80	3.80	3.60	3.10	3.50	3.90	3.50	2.80	3.50	41.40	3.00	44.40
CFRP 22-12	3.20	3.40		3.30	3.80	3.60	3.30	3.70	3.20	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.30	41.30	3.00	44.30
CFRP 32-12	3.64	3.27		3.18	3.73	3.18	2.82	3.73	3.09	3.91	3.82	3.00	3.09	40.45	3.18	43.64
CFRP 29-12	3.36	2.91		3.27	3.45	3.18	2.91	3.18	3.09	3.82	2.91	3.18	3.36	38.64	2.82	41.45
CFRP 35-12	3.00	2.91		2.73	2.64	2.55	3.09	3.91	2.64	3.36	3.00	3.45	3.91	37.18	2.73	39.91
CFRP 37-12	2.44	2.33		1.44	4.11	3.67	3.11	2.56	3.67	3.78	3.22	3.11	3.67	37.11	2.50	39.61
CFRP 19-12	2.18	1.82		2.64	4.00	3.64	3.55	2.73	4.09	3.36	2.82	2.09	3.27	36.18	2.36	38.55
CFRP 23-12	3.10	2.10		2.20	3.20	3.20	2.80	2.00	3.20	3.10	2.40	3.30	3.50	34.10	1.91	36.01
CFRP 17-12	2.20	1.80		1.10	3.60	3.90	2.90	2.30	3.50	3.90	3.10	1.60	3.20	33.10	2.80	35.90

Appendix D: Grants Recommended for Funding

Proposal #	Type/Forest	Project Title	Lead Organization	Type of Org.	Fed. Req	Total
CFRP 11-12	Utilization - Santa Fe	Crossing Boundaries with Small Tree Utilization in the Jemez Mountains	TC Company	Business	\$360,000	50.91
CFRP 08-12, Rev. 1	Utilization - Cibola	Improved Utilization of Small Diameter Trees in Central New Mexico 2012	Roger Tucker, Inc.	Business	\$120,000	48.36
CFRP 03-12,	Planning - Gila	Building Capacity & Diverse Partnerships Across Multiple Landscapes Through Improved Project Preparation	New Mexico Forest Industry Association	Non-Profit	\$360,000	47.88
CFRP 07-12	Planning - Cibola	Multi-Agency, Restoration Planning Near the Community of La Madera, Sandia Mountains, NM	Forest Fitness, LLC	Business	\$250,853	44.18
CFRP 28-12	Implementation - Carson	Ecosystem Process Restoration through Prescribed Fire Capacity Building in Black Lake	Forest Guild	Non-Profit	\$137,469	52.44
CFRP 34-12	Implementation - Carson	Implementation: Maquinita Ecosystem Health Project	Kuykendall & Sons Sawmill	Business	\$360,000	50.45
CFRP 24-12	Implementation - Gila	Gila Wood Products & Kellar Logging Collaborative Restoration Thinning and Market Fulfillment Partnership	Gila Wood Products, LLC	Business	\$359,881	47.95
CFRP 21-12	Implementation – Santa Fe	Gallinas Watershed Implementation Project (Calf Canyon WUI)	Southwest Wood Products & Thinning	Business	\$360,000	47.25
CFRP 27-12	Implementation - Carson	Implementation of Forest Restoration within Maquinitas Analysis Area	Rocky Mountain Youth Corps	Non-Profit	\$359,468	47.19
CFRP 26-12	Implementation - Carson	Healthy Forests Healthy Communities in Vallecitos	Alfonso Chacon Jr.	Business	\$360,000	47.05
CFRP 30-12 (Partial)	Implementation - Carson	Implementation: Mesa Juan Domingo Pinion/ Juniper Forest Restoration and Fuel Reduction in the Canjilon WUI	La Alba, LLC	Business	\$147,329	45.45
Total					\$3,175,000	

Appendix D. Grants Recommended for Funding

Approved:

/s/ Brent Racher

Brent Racher, Chairman

Chairman,

Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel

05/23/12

Date

Approved:

/s/ Corbin Newman

Corbin Newman, Regional Forester

Designated Federal Official,

Collaborative Forest Restoration Program Technical Advisory Panel

05/25/12

Date