

Community Forest Program
Panel Review Guidance

Rank each proposal based on the following four criteria. If there are additional notes or justifications for your score specific to the project (some piece stands apart as key to your score) that feedback on each criterion, or the project as a whole, would be valuable and should be included in your score sheet/notes. Our intent is to share general and specific feedback with applicants to develop interest and the size and quality of the future applicant pool. Additional comments regarding the process should be directed to Scott Stewart at 202-205-1618.

- 1) Using a score of 0-20 rate **community benefits**, where 20 is reserved for projects that have all attributes (economic, environmental, education, recreation) and have exceptional benefits in each attribute. It may be easier to think of the scale as 0-5 for each of the suggested benefit attributes of community forests including, but not limited to:
 - a) Economic benefits
 - i) Timber
 - ii) Non-timber forest products
 - b) Environmental benefits
 - i) Clean air and water
 - ii) Stormwater management
 - iii) Wildlife habitat
 - c) Forest-based learning
 - i) K-12 conservation education programs
 - ii) Vocational forestry/environmental science education programs
 - iii) Connection to other environmental education programs or experiential learning opportunities
 - iv) Replicable model of effective forest stewardship for private landowners
 - d) Recreational benefits through public access
 - i) Hiking
 - ii) Fishing
 - iii) Hunting
 - iv) Connection to other public access forest or non-forest areas
- 2) Using a scale of 0-5, rate the **public participation** ongoing and planned for the life of the community forest, where “Empowered” is a ballot or democratic process and “Informed” is telling the public what was decided. (Refer to the [IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation](#)) Engagement may include:
 - a) Planning the project
 - b) Management of the project
 - c) Determining access and use as well as other forest decisions
 - d) Or other aspects of the project.
- 3) Using a score of 0-5, rate the community forest’s **strategic contribution and connection** to broader landscape conservation initiative(s), with 5 meaning very connected/critical and 0 as isolated with no discernible connection.
- 4) On a scale of 0-5, rate the **threat** or likelihood that the project land would be subdivided or converted to non-forest use, where five is exceptional threatened and 0 is no threat/ impossible.