

**FY2014 Competitive Allocation Request for Proposals Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation**

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments <sup>1</sup>
<b>1) FY14-WI-059</b> Wisconsin's Wildland Urban Interface	#1	Ambitious and comprehensive program. Appreciate the measure of success, including, "Maintenance and support of Community Wildfire Protection Plan and Firewise Communities." The National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System form lists \$20,000 for "Preparedness," which the Request for Proposals lists as a prohibited activity. Budget shows \$53,880 for "other," which is not defined in the narrative.
	#2	Needs more information (map?) on where the communities are and a fuels description. The contextual description of Wisconsin communities and the fire risk situation, though brief, is helpful.
	#3	Implements Community Wildfire Protection Plans in at least 10 at-risk communities. Good list of deliverables. \$300,000.
	#4	Good, solid proposal.
	#5	Good straightforward objectives and accomplishments that meet the intent of a hazard mitigation grant!!! No budget explanation of "other funds" listed on budget table of \$53,880.

<sup>1</sup> The comments reflect the views of the reviewer only and do not necessarily reflect the interpretation of authorities by the Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry.

**FY2014 Competitive Allocation Request for Proposals Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation**

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
<p><b>2) FY14-MA-049</b>                      Massachusetts Hazardous Fuels and Community Mitigation Management</p>	#1	Much needed fuel management project, but much of the project language appears to be preparedness/capacity building. Narrative references the objective, "to increase wildland firefighting capacity and operational reliability." No National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System (NFPORS) form. One-third of the budget is allocated to "other" with no explanation of what it will be used for.
	#2	No budget description for "other." Using State forests as demonstration sites is good. High-priority areas.
	#3	Big, expensive project and not as innovative as asserted, but like the southeastern Massachusetts focus and tie to fire risk. Assume some extra expense is associated with working on islands.
	#4	Good combination of projects. Does training = capacity building?
	#5	Contributor match of \$290k is not shown in the budget table. Objective 6 is capacity building for training, which is not allowable under hazard mitigation grants.
	#6	Smaller match.
	#7	Training.
	#8	Need NFPORS form.

**FY2014 Competitive Allocation Request for Proposals Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation**

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>3) FY14-NY-001</b> Shawangunk Ridge Fire-Adapted Communities	#1	This is not a "new" project. Some activities appear to be related to preparedness/capacity building: Support mobilization to "help them attain higher level qualifications." "Enhancing the ability of wildfire suppression resources." Budget suggests that fuel reduction activities will be "contracted" for \$97,000. If the project is contracting services out, why the need to train firefighters? No letter of support/not signed by the State Forester.
	#2	Good project. Contracting prescription burn. High-priority areas. Implementing and monitoring prescription burns and training.
	#3	Follows on previous similar, seemingly successful projects. At what point is this self-sustaining? \$115,292.
	#4	Sounds like some capacity building.
	#5	Goal 3 training/capacity building not allowable under hazard mitigation grant funds. Travel cost for training to other areas to support firefighter training and experience. Prescribed burning cost of \$500/acre.
	#6	Training. Tools. How long will we continue to fund this?
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>4) FY14-MI-017</b> Michigan Communities at Risk/Community Wildfire Protection Plan Development & Project Implementation Support	#1	Narrative suggests followup on Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs) to ensure mitigation recommendations are implemented, but the National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System form suggests no activities other than development of CWPPs (2). Good Partnerships/collaboration.
	#2	Good project focus: rural Michigan counties/towns with very limited capacity and often overlooked given other State issues.
	#3	Focus CWPP efforts on communities identified as at high risk of wildfire. Two communities to write new CWPPs. \$102,000.
	#4	I like the idea of continuing work, not just developing new CWPPs and forgetting about the ones you already have.
	#5	Contributor match not shown in the budget table.
	#6	No match.
	#7	Match?

**FY2014 Competitive Allocation Request for Proposals Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation**

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>5) FY14-MD-068</b> Expanding Firewise and Creating Fire Adapted Communities in the Appalachian and Piedmont Regions in Maryland	#1	Not clear what the deliverables are. There are references in the narrative to Community Wildfire Protection Plans, fuel reduction, but no target numbers. Refers to "Attached [National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System] NFPORS Form" but no form is attached. Suggests non-allowed activities: "Educating firefighters to be better prepared for wildfire," "Work with county governments to assist with their wildfire preparedness efforts." Extensive partnerships.
	#2	The chipper is an innovative concept and good. They appear to be leasing or contracting the chipper – no equipment costs. No quantities of deliverables – 15 partners – 15 communities – subgrants?
	#3	Proposal to continue, build upon, and expand the Firewise Maryland program. Supplemental to core program work? \$285,000.
	#4	High personnel costs.
	#5	More than 25% of funds for salaries. Need NFPORS form.
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>6) FY14-MN-003</b> Expanding Firewise Outreach and Mitigation	#1	Good program description, clear objectives, well-defined deliverables. Would be helpful to distinguish in the narrative the difference between Level 1 (satellite) vs. Level 2 (on-the-ground) assessments.
	#2	Refers to "project area" but I could find no description or justification for where the effort will be focused. No map. No fuels description. High cost for limited justification, though it seems excellent work would be done.
	#3	Utilizes new Light Detection and Ranging data in assessing need and focusing Firewise efforts. \$365,000.
	#4	Personnel cost high.
	#5	Ok.
	#6	Research (Light Detection and Ranging)?
	#7	More than 25% of funds for salaries.

**FY2014 Competitive Allocation Request for Proposals Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation**

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
<p><b>7) FY14-MI-036</b> Expanding Audiences for the Michigan Firewise Communities Project</p>	#1	<p>Not clear if Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs) will be developed using funds. The narrative states, "Assist additional at-risk communities expressing interest in developing a CWPP as funds for the program become available," but the National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System form suggests no CWPPs will be developed. Prevention focused on planning and zoning officials, high-risk property owners.</p>
	#2	<p>Good project, but I believe 300k is too much, and [it would be] better to focus more. In particular, I think the best case is made for focus on the Great Lakes shoreline property owners, more so than the other two, though I understand the rationale for all three.</p>
	#3	<p>Michigan State University Extension Firewise proposal to expand to target three new audiences in high-risk areas of the State through Webinar and face-to-face sessions with planning and zoning officials. Public service announcements to be produced. Supplemental to core program work? \$300,288.</p>
	#4	<p>Personnel costs are high; &gt;40% and travel.</p>
	#5	<p>Indirect rate &gt;43%. Low accomplishments other than outreach. Needs a more integrated approach in objectives.</p>
	#6	<p>More than 25% of funds for salaries.</p>

**FY2014 Competitive Allocation Request for Proposals Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation**

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>8) FY14-OH-081</b> Targeted Hazard Mitigation Projects to Address Wildfire Risk	#1	Major focus is on State Parks/lands not in the wildland-urban interface. Targeted Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) development is positive as are prevention efforts in areas of high fire occurrence.
	#2	Weak project proposal. State Parks proposed as treatment areas – demo. Don't indicate what kind of data to be collected. Indicate CWPPs will continue to be developed, but not how many and where. Nebulous measures. Weak partnerships and expected outcomes. Has a National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System (NFPORS) form.
	#3	Revise statewide wildland fire risk assessment for targeted Ohio Department of Natural Resources land and surrounding communities based on values. \$105,000. High overhead.
	#4	Personnel a big cost; >60%.
	#5	Measure of success did not define accomplishments, but listed on the NFPORS form. May exceed 25% salary cap???
	#6	More than 25% of funds for salaries. NFPORS form shows \$10,000 in equipment that does not show up in budget table.
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>9) FY14-NH-075</b> Improving Water Delivery to Combat Wildland Fire in Rural New Hampshire	#1	This project appears to be all preparedness/capacity building; focusing on development of plans for water supply. No National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System form. No letter of support from State Forester.
	#2	Builds from existing efforts – good. Low cost and effective.
	#3	A good, local, focused project within capabilities. Not innovative, but solid and focused and community oriented for first responders to do their job better.
	#4	No tie to Community Wildfire Protection Plan or hazard mitigation. Dry hydrants not allowable under a hazard mitigation grant. Objectives are a repeat of the project proposal and no specific accomplishments are listed.
	#5	Eligible project?
	#6	\$25,000 equipment match not explained. Capacity building does not meet the intent of the RFP.