

FY 2018 Landscape Scale Restoration Request for Proposals Reviewers' Comments

1. FY18 IA-015

Block By Block: Transforming Disaster into Community Engagement

- No mentions of timelines or how this work could be shared in the many other states also affected by emerald ash borer where similar work is occurring. Otherwise, a great project to support.
- Good components with wood utilization, plans for communities, and replanting. However, a good part of replanting deals with seedlings. No tracking for survival and high mortality potential.
- This project integrates social, economic, and environmental benefits.
- Good planned collaboration on private lands.

2. FY18 MI-052

Protecting Michigan's Hemlock Resource

- Good issue identification and a clear outreach goal of 10% of population awareness.
- Success depends on actions taken by the public.

3. FY18 CT-043

Connecticut's Land Trusts: A Sustainable Model for Habitat Management

- Excellent return on investment and leverage potential.

4. FY18 MI-026

Trout and Trees: Linking Forests and Streams Through On-the-ground Restoration and Education

- Only one of the State & Private Forestry themes apply – enhancing public benefits. Benefits are primarily to water resources and not forest resources. No new approaches, concepts, or collaborations. OK project, narrow focus. Not sure how it builds going forward. Technology transfer has nothing new for the program. Important work and high budget.
- Excellent job with project overview and desired future condition.

5. FY18 MI-033

Little Bridges of Michigan Counties

- Strong outreach component and long-lasting impacts with crane mat use. Could have used letters of support from industry and partners.
- Project actually will help implement a significant BMP by providing 400 hardwood crane mats to loggers.

6. FY18 NJ-010

New Jersey Invasive Species Strike Team – Expanding Partnerships to Increase Strategic Invasive Plant Control

- Like the concept but it is an expansion of a former similar grant.

7. FY18 OH-041

Upland Oak Sustainability and Management in the Central Hardwood Region

- Good multistate initiative.
- Would be helpful if proposal would speak to why loss of oak is a big deal.

8. FY18 MA-038

Grassroots Tree Planting in Two Small Low-Income Cities within Rural Massachusetts

- Solid project with potential to reach underserved population and impact area forest management. Very small scale, not regional. Would have liked to see a more direct communication component linking this work to the neighboring rural forested landscape.

9. FY18 IA-017

Healthy Forests Lower Missouri River Valley

- This project does propose the removal of invasive species, but not at the landscape level. It is not clear who would implement the model developed by the project or that there is any interest or resources to do so. Without the actual implementation of the plans, many of the measurable results will not be achieved without additional resources.
- Strong proposal: hits on tools for communities restoring trees, education, and partner involvement with distinct responsibilities.

10. FY18 WI-056

Financial Contributions of the Urban Forest Industry and Resource in the Northeastern Area

- Focused on producing/providing information and awareness on the value of the urban forest; can assist States in implementing some Forest Action Plan goals, but that will be up to the States; this project does not implement [that] itself. Broad-scale value to all 20 states in the Northeastern Area. Results measured in number of reports rather than outcomes; good collaboration planned, but much will be dependent on the contractor used.
- Connection to State Forest Action Plans not compelling. Return on Investment not compelling for this expensive project.

11. FY18 NJ-051

Storms, Sewers, and Social Justice: Increasing Resiliency in Two Sewersheds of the Delaware River Watershed

- This project will plant 956 trees, which is operational. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's methods and timelines. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application did not demonstrate much awareness of and reliance on similar work done by others for their project methods. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices.
- Not clear on the benefits of the trees to offset 23 billion gallons of runoff.

12. FY18 MN-006

Landscape Scale Restoration with Prescribed Fire in Minnesota

- Impressed with the acreage amount of the treatments.

13. FY18 MN-007

Protecting Minnesota's Family Lake Resorts and Enhancing Local Tourism Through Forest Stewardship

- Nice targeted approach to land stewardship for a specific audience.
- This project does not propose any on-the-ground action other than potential purchase of conservation easements to prevent subdivision of large tracts of forested lands. The proposal does not explain how stewardship plans will be implemented nor does it target many of the intended measurable results.
- Outcomes are dependent on implementation by resort owners.

14. FY18 IL-014

Landscape Scale Stewardship Clusters: Prioritized Implementation of Oak Ecosystem Recovery

- This project proposes survey, outreach, and treatment of high-priority forest land, including parks, refuges, and conservation areas to address specific threats, including invasive shrubs and restoration. The proposal is specific regarding methods, prioritization, and measurable results. Points off for weak description of leveraged funding and very vague description of knowledge and technical transfer, but otherwise this is a great project to support.
- A lot of emphasis on surveys but not much on implementation.

15. FY18 DE-031

Chesapeake Tree Stewards: Mobilizing a Network for Tree Canopy

- Only one measure of outcomes, others are actions. Outreach is solid to existing demographics – no mention of targeting younger generations.

16. FY18 OH-008

Enhancing Hemlock Health: Protecting an Imperiled Tree Species Across the Mid-Atlantic Region

- Should this be funded through Landscape Scale Restoration rather than the hemlock woolly adelgid national program?
- Overall, solid, multistate project with a clearly identified issue. Solid schedule and plan. Very good, integrated, and aligned with State plan.

17. FY18 MO-021

Kansas City's Energy-Saving Trees

- Good program idea.
- This project would plant 1,500 trees, which seems like a good goal, overall. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's methods, timelines, and resources. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices. In Section 5: Knowledge Transfer, this application did not discuss outreach from this project or how the project might be transferable to others.

18. FY18 MA-045

Creating a Replicable Model for Significantly Expanding Urban Forest Canopy in Low-Income Neighborhoods

- No comments recorded.

19. FY18 MD-048

Weathering the Storm: Strategies for Long-term Management of Tidal Forested Wetlands Decimated by Emerald Ash Borer

- This project seems like it will operationally get work done by protecting about 700 trees from emerald ash borer and planting about 600 trees to help restore impacted forests. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's timelines and resources. In Section 2: Measurable Results, the application did not discuss why the area was high priority and said that they would search for lingering genotypes of ash in the impacted forest – which may or may not be accomplishable. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application did not demonstrate reliance on similar work done by others for their project methods. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices.
- Solid articulation of the need and plan to address it. Good outreach and communication plans.
- Return on Investment is not compelling, and there were several typos.

20. FY18 MN-029

Advanced Wood Basket Analysis Training

- No comments recorded.

21. FY18 IA-016

Promoting Pollinators in Southwest Iowa Woodlands

- Primarily an outreach, planning, and demonstration project. Not clear how the plan will be implemented at a landscape level without additional resources. Proposal does not target many of the intended measurable results.
- Good intent, but the proposal seems to advocate for activities that are or should be already occurring.

22. FY18 MA-037

Northeast Area Multistate Comprehensive Oak Wilt Monitoring Project

- Threat identification was good but measurable results and technical transfer were lacking.
- Proposal provided very little detail. Unclear how data gathered from monitoring would be translated to prevent further transmission. Doesn't address existing efforts in other NA States. No target numbers for training and only one training per State – limited impact potential.
- Oak wilt is spreading aggressively across the NA States.

23. FY18 MN-002

Engaging Cities and Citizens in Managing Ash for Stormwater Mitigation along the Mississippi River

- A lot of money going to tree removals. Developing handouts seems dated.
- In the big scheme of things, not sure this will have a tremendous water quality benefit.
- Very good and well written.

24. FY18 NH-011

Town Forests and Citizen Science: A Tool for Public Engagement and Stewardship Planning

- Excellent proposal to help local communities.

25. FY18 MI-025

State Forest Utilization and Marketing Program Operational Funding

- Lack of markets is only issue identified. Logger training needed more emphasis along with other issues.
- Very focused project with clear measures and outcomes. Good tech transfer described with a wide variety of venues and tools. Very good, integrated, and aligned with State plan.
- Good effort and vision.

26. FY18 PA-030

Southern Laurel Highlands Plant and Pest Management Partnership Woody Invasive Plant Suppression and Habitat Restoration Project

- Fairly small scale, but three properties working together to address common threat. Overall, OK project. Nothing new or innovative. Showed need, but a similar needs exist across the landscape. Nothing new in the outreach plans.
- Proposal does not describe a desired future condition.

27. FY18 IN-039

Providing Select Bare-Root Nursery Stock to Targeted Low-Canopy Cities and Urban Schools

- Good numbers of seedlings being planted, but they will be dealing with high mortality potential.

28. FY18 MD-047

Working Forests for Water Quality in Baltimore Reservoirs

- This project's main goal is to write a plan, although a small pilot project will be created. Writing a plan may be a step towards landscape restoration, but little actual landscape restoration will be implemented. For this reason, about half of the points (15) potentially earned in the Measurable Results section were deducted. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's methods, timelines, and resources. In Section 2: Measurable Results, the application states that it will protect a large amount of land through writing a plan, which may not necessarily be true. These measures should relate some more to the project's goal as well. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application hints at awareness of and reliance on similar work done by others for their project methods. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices. In addition, the application only discusses using outreach through websites as leverage, which is not sufficient in comparison to all the other applications.
- Plan is for one large landowner. Needed more objectives for surrounding private land.

29. FY18 VT-023

Trees for Greens: A Partnership to Strengthen Urban Forestry Efforts and Spark Village Revitalization

- I like the Trees for Greens idea, but I'm not sure if a publication will reach a good target audience.

30. FY18 OH-009

Longitudinal Assessment of Urban Tree Canopy following Emerald Ash Borer

- Attempts to address the issue of emerald ash borer mortality and how it has impacted previous assessments.
- While an urban tree canopy assessment is a good first step, very little was offered on how the information will be used or a request for funds for outreach and support of issues revealed.
- Project collaboration includes many partners in each region of the State with Ohio DNR being the common thread between the regions. Well-written, thought-out assessment and monitoring of changes to urban canopies with a large area and population impacted.

31. FY18 IL-053

Forest Habitat and Stewardship – by Air!

- This project could accomplish a lot of operational work by treating 6,000 to 8,000 acres of honeysuckle, although I'm not sure if this technique has been used before? In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or CLEARLY ARTICULATE the project's methods, timelines, and resources. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application did not specifically say who would be doing what or what each partner brings to the table. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices. In Section 5: Knowledge Transfer, this application was fairly specific on a couple outreach approaches, but overall was general on how information would be distributed.
- Statewide scope too large for this grant. Only 6, 000 – 8,000 acres impacted. Would seem that cost share with landowners is an intended use of grant funds, which is out of scope for Landscape Scale Restoration grants.
- Not sure of landowner involvement in stewardship.

32. FY18 VT-022

Engaging Landowners at the Point of Conservation Action

- This seems like a good project that could have many benefits if landowners actually do treat 2,500 acres – as predicted in the Measurable Results section; otherwise this project only creates a database of good potential locations. For this reason, half of the points (18) potentially earned in the Measurable Results section were deducted. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's resources. In Section 2: Measurable Results, the application did not discuss why the area was high priority. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application did not say who would be doing what and how partners would specifically contribute to the project's work. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices.
- Unclear of the significance of the described outcome. Needs a better metric and starting point. Not many specifics on knowledge/technology transfer.

33. FY18 WV-028

Establishing a Peer-to-Peer Forest Health Network in West Virginia

- Unclear as to followup or how they would measure success, especially with landowner connections.
- Project success depends on "natural spread." Not clear how this will happen.

34. FY18 MN-001

Managing Forest Land Conversion Risk to Protect Lakes and Streams of Minnesota Forests

- Unclear on how this will be communicated to end users.
- This proposal is very well written and proposes to use a technical approach to prioritization, risk assessment, and identifying beneficial attributes of forested land. The proposal falls short by not discussing how the results of the analysis will be utilized in specific, on-the-ground action, which is reflected in measurable outcomes.

35. FY18 IL-013

Implementation of the Oak Ecosystem Recovery Plan in Northern Illinois

- Project proposes to implement the existing Oak Ecosystem Recovery Plan by mapping and prioritizing oak complexes, conducting workshops, and creating demonstration sites. However, it seems like no on-the-ground activities will be done at a landscape level unless homeowners take it upon themselves. Several of the measurable results cannot be achieved without additional resources.
- Great idea but not strong and clear on the interaction between the committees and landowners.

36. FY18 WV-005

UAV Assisted Inspections of Logging BMPs

- I like the concept of using Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) more, but still think there needs to be boots on the ground.
- This is limited in scope to assist in complying with State law.

37. FY18 IA-020

Forestry For the Birds – Iowa River Corridor Bird Conservation Area

- This project could accomplish a good amount of monitoring and would institute a plan, but won't accomplish landscape scale restoration without additional resources – for this reason, half of the points (18) potentially earned in the Measurable Results section were deducted. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's methods, timelines, and resources. In Section 2: Measurable Results, the application did not discuss why the area was high priority, but was good otherwise. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application hinted at an awareness of and reliance on similar work done by others for their project methods. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices.
- Seems small scale with limited potential impact. Good collaboration. Did not try to align with State plan.
- On-the-ground outcomes dependent on private landowner implementation of plans.

38. FY18 VT-032

Real News Not Pulp Fiction – Storytelling

- I like this project. It is trying new, modern approaches to reaching out to the public where State Agencies have a hard time justifying or reallocating their core funding. Exciting project, potentially broadly transferable results. Described project and outcomes thoroughly and clearly.

39. FY18 NY-035

Fire Dependent Ecosystem Restoration in New York

- Not really clear on the connections between people and the outdoors on a broad scale.

40. FY18 NJ-054

Advancing Forest Ecosystem Management in the Mid-Atlantic Region

- This needs to be a continuing effort to work with these groups, but [there's] no indication of followup or continued effort.
- Reasonable amount to invest.
- Not sure about how the goals will be accomplished.

41. FY18 IL-012

Enhancing Invasive Plant Management in Northeastern Forests by Improving Communication of BMPs

- I like the regional benefits that this application will cover.
- This project identifies the threat as invasive plants, which is quite broad, and it proposes to address the threat using a database. The proposal lacks specifics about how areas will be prioritized and what resources and personnel will be used to conduct on-the-ground activities using information from the database. The project does not target many of the intended measurable results.

42. FY18 MD-034

Stemming the Tide: Quantifying the Effects of Saltwater Intrusion on the Mid-Atlantic Region for Better Forest Management

- Seems to address only a small area relative to statewide forest issues.
- Overall, appears to be a solid project that addresses a clearly defined need. Didn't answer all questions thoroughly. I am unsure how the data will be used to influence future, on-the-ground behaviors.
- Critical area for future vegetation response to saltwater intrusion due to a changing climate.

43. FY18 PA-040

Implementing Riparian Forest Buffers in Pennsylvania through Precision Conservation

- Incomplete application. Budget is not laid out. Seems to recommend a bunch of meetings.

44. FY18 IA-018

Reaching the Unengaged: A New Approach to Outreach to Increase Active Woodland Management in Southeast and South Central Iowa

- This proposal offers no on-the-ground activities other than in the demonstration areas. However, it is very well written, specific, and potentially very beneficial for strategic outreach and training. Several of the measurable results cannot be achieved without additional resources.
- Clear measures will show results. Good outreach plan; could be a model for others. Very good, integrated, and aligned with State plan.
- Appears to be basic core program.

45. FY18 NY-049

New York State Kudzu Management, Survey, and Outreach

- Ongoing project with existing resources; this doesn't appear to add long-term capacity. Outreach program is minimal and only appears to reach out to those with existing finds, not neighboring landowners.
- Simple, clearly described, straightforward. I would have been comfortable providing funding at a higher level if requested.

46. FY18 CT-042

Fighting Climate Change: Improving the Resiliency of Challenged Urban Landscapes

- Positive project for Connecticut communities. Failed to mention similar programs in a number of other States that it could build on. Nothing really new. Costs seem high for this project. Why contracting maintenance when the project is to train staff to do the maintenance? Not sure if it aligns with State plan. Also, limited area for knowledge transfer.
- Good intent and benefit but seems like a very expensive proposal for the number of people trained and number of tree plantings.

47. FY18 NY-036

Establishing a Sustainable Post-Disaster Urban Canopy

- No clear outreach plan explained; 1,620 trees planted is the only accomplishment listed.
- Seems an unfortunate oversight that, despite narrative description of ambitious proposed activities, there were not corresponding quantified deliverables in the table other than trees planted.
- Excellent job connecting to the State Forest Action Plan. Less than 20% of the budget goes to the primary deliverable – planting 900 trees.

48. FY18 MO-019

Blue River Action Plan: Revitalizing Communities with Forest Corridors

- This project proposes to restore 100 acres within Kansas City for urban forests. This seems like a good project that could have many benefits; however, there were many grammatical errors and missing information in many of the sections. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's methods, timelines, and resources. In Section 2: Measurable Results, the application did not discuss why the area was high priority, said the project was protecting from invasives AND NATIVES, and used percentages as measures in areas they clearly meant to use a different measurement. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application did not demonstrate awareness of and reliance on similar work done by others for their project methods of restoring urban lots. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices. In Section 5: Knowledge Transfer, this application was fairly specific on a couple outreach approaches, but overall was general on how information would be distributed.
- This is not ratable with many unanswered questions. This proposal lacks clarity. The budget narrative identifies only \$120,000 for contracts, not \$140,000, which is what is allocated for the Federal funds section. The applicant identifies \$239,000 contractual for use of settlement funding in budget, but it looks like it must be dedicated to wetlands restoration. It is not clear what the contractual services from these funds would be used for. They mention land acquisition and easements but make it sound like a separate project because the results table only lists 40 acres of accomplishment.

49. FY18 WI-057

Development of a Web-Based Interactive Geospatial Wood Industry Directory for the Northeast Region

- This project only creates a database of wood products for industries to be able to search. For this reason, half of the points (18) potentially earned in the Measurable Results section were deducted. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals, timeline, or the project's resources, or mention any significant threats or issues. In Section 2: Measurable Results, the application seemed incomplete and did not discuss why the area was high priority. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application did not say why the partners would be good at this project or demonstrate awareness of similar work. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices. In Section 5, the applicant did not say how this project could be applied on a larger scale, which would be an important part of doing this project – so everyone could get involved in such a website and contribute to it.
- Project overview and collaboration are particularly strong.

50. FY18 WV-004

Developing a Model Forest Network in West Virginia

- Seems very focused on one site; not sure how it translates broadly.
- Very well written.

51. FY18 MA-046

Gray to Green: Forest Conservation and Urban Trees on a Watershed Basis Using an Innovative Partnership and Funding Methods

- Green infrastructure projects are vaguely defined. Needed more on promotion and planned implementation.
- Proposal description is wandering and unclear.

52. FY18 WV-003

Exploring Economic Opportunities for Wood Byproducts from Forest Products Manufacturing

- This application seems to have more local benefits than regional ones.
- A single issue [is] identified and [there is] no clear description of threats to the resource or industry. On-the-ground impact seems minimal.
- What threat or priority as articulated in the State Forest Action Plan does this project address?

53. FY18 WI-027

Engaging the Unengaged Landowner to Proactively Manage Stands, Reducing Vulnerability to Catastrophic Losses From an Invasive Pest

- This project only has outreach and does not seem like it would complete any work on the ground unless the landowners complete the work themselves. For this reason, half of the points (18) potentially earned in the Measurable Results section were deducted. In Section 1: Priority Issues, the application did not discuss the project's scope in relation to the project's goals or the project's methods, timelines, and resources. In Section 2: Measurable Results, the application states that it will protect a large amount of land through outreach, which may not necessarily be true – there is also not much support provided in the text section. In Section 3: Collaboration, the application did not demonstrate awareness of and reliance on similar work done by others for their project methods. In Section 4: Leverage, the application did not thoroughly explain how their approach was effective or how it would relate to sustainable practices. In addition, the application only discusses using outreach through websites as leverage, which is not sufficient in comparison to all the other applications. In Section 5: Knowledge Transfer, this application was fairly specific on a couple outreach approaches, but overall was general on how information would be distributed.
- No reference to the Stewardship Program, no reference to Tools for Engaging Landowners Effectively, no outputs. Underplanting 120,000 acres? How many seedlings?

54. FY18 CT-044

A Performance Indicator-Based Intensive Survey of Woodland Owners in Southern New England

- Lots of proposed actions but not clear, on-the-ground results and outcomes with stakeholder groups.

55. FY18 WI-055

Maximizing the Value of High-Volume Influxes of Wood Resulting from Forest Health-Related Mortality

- Very abbreviated application; short on detail and vague on outcomes.
- Too limited in scope. Will have minimal impact on land management.
- Does not link proposal to State Forest Action Plan. Good intent and benefits but does not fit too well with Landscape Scale Restoration objectives.

56. FY18 IN-024

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Blue Growth Fund

- Too many unknowns – what if the U.S. Endowment for Forestry & Communities doesn't provide funding? What study shows it is not a feasible project? The focus of the project is not in line with landscape scale restoration. Its success will have more impact on keeping forest industry health, which is important for future management. Support letters were lackluster. Vague description. Seems very speculative with key project match not secured.
- There is no certainty with rules for use of the fund, oversight, etc. Only a portion would go to forestry, so how can I rate leverage and outcomes with indeterminate, on-the-ground effects? The match is also not a firm match at this time. The contractual category is very expensive without detail on how many contractors and specific deliverables.
- Complex structure and funding model.