

**USDA Forest Service  
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program  
Advisory Panel Conference Call Summary  
February 4, 2011**

**Summary** – The conference call on February 4, 2011 was for the CFLR program’s Advisory Panel to discuss and come to a consensus on Fiscal Year 2011 (FY11) proposal evaluation procedures and FY11 funding recommendations. The call was open to the public and members of the public had the opportunity to provide comments.

**Present on Call** – Julia Altemus, Maia J. Enzer, Karen Hardigg, Brian Kahn, Dr. James Kennamer, Paige Lewis, Gary Nakamura, Dr. Brent Racher, Philip Rigdon, Todd Schulke, Gary J. Severson, Scott Simon, Ray Vaughan, Tom Peterson, Robert Harper, Megan Roessing, Lauren Lesch, Susan Balint, and Marci DuPraw (facilitator).

**Opening Remarks**

Tom Peterson, Director of Forest Management for the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service (USFS), began the meeting of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CLFRP) Advisory Panel by thanking the Panel for making time for this conference call. Mr. Peterson informed the Panel about changes on the Forest Management Staff in the USFS Washington, DC office. Tom Peterson also informed the committee that he is retiring from the Forest Service. As Mr. Peterson is the Designated Federal Official (DFO) for the panel, a new DFO will be appointed. Mr. Peterson did not know who that will be, but will let the panel know as soon as possible.

**CFLRP Update**

Mr. Peterson informed the Panel the USFS is operating under a continuing resolution since Congress has yet to pass a budget for FY11. Therefore, the Forest Service does not know how much funding maybe available for new CFLRP projects. However, Mr. Peterson recommended that the May 2011 Panel meeting proceed, even if funding for new projects is not available. Then the Forest Service would keep the list of proposals recommended by the panel for the Secretary to use if funding is available in future years. Tom Peterson also provided an update on the implementation of the CFLRP program in the Washington office.

**Overview of Agenda**

Facilitator Marci DuPraw welcomed the Panel to the call and said she looked forward to working with the panel to reach a consensus on the procedures Panel will use for evaluating the FY11 proposals and to reach a consensus for procedures related to funding recommendations. She noted that various groups define “consensus” differently and proposed defining it as ‘everyone can live with what has been proposed’ for the Panel’s current meeting. The Panel concurred. Ms.

DuPraw then explained the procedures for hearing public comments on the call and directed members of the public to press \*1 if they wanted to get into the queue for the public comment period.

### **FY11 Proposal Evaluation Procedures**

Ms. DuPraw began the discussion by providing an overview of the procedures found on the document titled “Draft: CFLRP Proposal Evaluation Procedures” (attachment A). The public was notified that all the draft materials were available at <http://www.fs.fed.us/resoration/cflr/submittingproposals.html>.

Lauren Lesch then provided an overview of the draft pre-meeting evaluation forms (attachment B, C, D). The first form, “Draft Pre-Meeting Proposal Scoring Sheet – FY11 Proposal Review” is meant for panel members to take notes on only (attachment B). Panel members would then take the scores from that sheet, enter them into the Pre-Meeting Proposal spreadsheet (attachment C), and email the spreadsheet to Susan Balint at shbalint@fs.fed.us. Panel members would have the opportunity to change their scores during the May meeting. Washington Office staff would compile the information from these spreadsheets into the document titled “DRAFT: CFLRP Panel Pre-Meeting Initial Scoring Report” (attachment D). This report would provide Panel members with a comprehensive picture of how other Panel members reviewed each project. No Panel member names would be on this document. Prior to the meeting Marci DuPraw and Susan Balint would meet to discuss where Panel members diverged in their evaluation of the proposals. This divergence would be the basis for discussion during the May 2011 meeting.

Ms. DuPraw asked if there were any questions or refinements about the pre-meeting evaluation procedures and documents. The Panel commended the organization of the documents and procedures. Scott Simon asked if there was a place for proposals to describe the history of landscape scale restoration. Lauren Lesch reported that there is a place in the RFP where that question is asked. Maia Enzer inquired if the proposals have to address every bulleted question in the RFP. Washington Office staff said they do not. Maia Enzer asked if the italicized “overview” of the RFP questions could be incorporated into the pre-meeting evaluation documents. Washington Office staff agreed they could be.

The Panel approved the evaluation procedures and the evaluation forms for the FY11 proposals, with the addition of the italicized “overview” language to the pre-meeting proposal-scoring sheet.

### **FY11 Funding Recommendation Procedures**

Marci DuPraw then directed the Panel’s attention to the document, “Draft: CFLRP Funding Recommendation Procedures” (attachment E). Lauren Lesch provided an overview of the draft document. Some of the Panel members found the draft document confusing and some felt it did

not relate to their interpretation of the Panel's role. A new proposal was brought forth by Julia Altemus to recommend the top projects and let the Secretary of Agriculture determine the funding. The Panel discussed the proposal made by Julia Altemus and approved it.

Panel decided to recommend the top proposals and to let the Secretary of Agriculture determine how available funding will be distributed.

### **Public Comments**

Marci DuPraw then transitioned into the public comment section of the call. One person provided comments. Roger Jaegel, a Trinity County Supervisor from California, asked the Panel to give priority to projects that provide for public health and safety by suppressing and preventing wildfires. He stressed to the Panel the importance of landscape conservation. He also requested that Panel members formally coordinate with Trinity County.

### **Agenda for May Meeting**

After the public comments section, the Panel moved into discussion about the upcoming May meeting. Some Panel members expressed a desire to know more about the FY10 CFLRP projects. Mr. Peterson suggested that the on-going National Forest Foundation-led peer learning calls provided that opportunity. Several Panel members would like more information and suggested that the 12 questions (attachment F) developed at the October administration meeting of the advisory panel would increase panel member understanding of current CFLRP projects. Several panel members expressed a desire for the projects they select to be successful and to learn from past projects. Mr. Peterson stressed that the Panel is chartered to evaluate proposals based only on information within that proposal. He then said that the 12 questions (attachment F) would be sent as an "optional response" to current projects. The projects can then email their response or post responses on their website. The Panel accepted Mr. Peterson's suggestion.

Julia Altemus suggested that the Panel have a group dinner during the May meeting. Panel agreed.

### **Closing Remarks**

Tom Peterson thanked the Panel members for all their hard work and thanked members who participated in the working groups that developed the draft proposal for the Advisory Panel call. The Panel thanked Tom Peterson for all his work and commended him for setting a great example of a collaborative approach.