

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments ¹
FY12-CT-184	#1	Inventory/planning is OK. Need more results.
	#2	Outcomes not well defined. High administrative costs.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-CT-185	#1	Expensive.
	#2	Need better tie to priority landscapes methods development.
	#3	Research oriented.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-CT-187	#1	Great idea, but the cost per acre under a Stewardship Plan seems high.
	#2	Nearly 3:1 match. Good collaboration. Multifaceted.
	#3	Need better tie to priority landscapes.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-CT-188	#1	Indirect costs are very high.
	#2	Timeline for accomplishments not well defined.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-CT-189	#1	Good proposal, leverage.
	#2	Plenty of match without anticipated volunteer hours. Replicating award-winning urban tree canopy tool.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-CT-190	#1	Should include letters of support.
	#2	No specifics on number of meetings and pubs. Results were mostly database, surveys, meetings, and pubs. Did not highlight collaboration very well. Leverage section was weak. Cash match was a plus.
	#3	Deliverables not well defined. High administrative costs.

¹ 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.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-DC-179	#1	High priority. Ties to canopy goals.
	#2	Great idea; just seems expensive for 1,500 trees planted.
	#3	Extremely expensive. UCF authorities only (no FHP).
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-DE-068	#1	Demonstration project.
	#2	Volunteer match.
	#3	Need better tie to priority landscapes. Timeline needs improvement.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-DE-069	#1	Well put together proposal.
	#2	Good job of referencing issues and threats and tying them to State and Federal documents. Outcomes seemed a little sparse for the amount of money requested.
	#3	Community involvement, multipartner effort. Improve canopy cover.
	#4	Good collaboration but needs to tie to priorities in the State Forest Action Plan.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-004	#1	Good proposal.
	#2	Probably not an eligible applicant/recipient (a private, for-profit company). No DUNS or EIN provided as required. "Recipient" lists self as "partner." City of Des Moines seems to think this is a "DNR" project, rather than Davey Tree.
	#3	Budget based on future projections needs better tie to the State Forest Action Plan.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-007	#1	Work done on State lands. Is this OK?
	#2	No apparent "landscape plan" or group present or involved. Just concentrating usual programs in a geographic area. Not really "landscape planning." Don't see why they should spend >50% of effort creating "Forest Stewardship Plans" on "public" lands. Those are really for private forests/owners. Not legitimate to claim "leverage" benefit from existing Federal programs like EQIP and WHIP.
	#3	Stewardship funding for public lands is for demonstration only.
	#4	Unsure about some activities on public lands and exactly how public lands are defined in this application.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-021	#1	Lots of planning and demonstration.
	#2	"Stewardship Project" – expensive.
	#3	Stewardship funding for public lands is for demonstration only.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-022	#1	Good project; has possibility to be national or regional model.
	#2	General outcomes. No mention of Urban Tree Canopy Assessment.
	#3	Deliverables need better definition.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-045	#1	Budget numbers for cooperative contributors do not add up.
	#2	Low priority. In the "big picture" for State, NA S&PF, and the U.S. Forest Service. No partners, collaboration, or leverage indicated.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-074	#1	Good collaboration with partners.
	#2	Project links private and public landowners in a watershed approach.
	#3	Stewardship Project approach good.
	#4	Comprehensive stewardship planning and outreach. Methodical. High cost.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-155	#1	Just a study/report.
	#2	Forest Reserve Program – interesting proposal.
	#3	Survey and data analysis need better tie to the State Forest Action Plan.
	#4	Unclear connection between action and outcomes. No support demonstrated.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-135	#1	Cost seems high for size and scope of project.
	#2	Unclear how "desired future condition" was arrived at or by whom. No real collaboration or partnership in evidence. Budget unspecified ("up to \$1.53 million") and unrealistic.
	#3	Expensive. Noncommercial thinning – NRCS-EQIP?
	#4	Ownership of preserve not identified. Demonstration project.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-136	#1	Very expensive for 14 acres of work.
	#2	Could this also be considered under Forest Health? Well written. No State Forester signature or letter of support regarding partnership.
	#3	Ownership of property not clear. Demonstration project on public lands.
	#4	Budget figures do not track.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-141	#1	Needs more concrete outcomes.
	#2	Seems to be a duplicative effort to the Urban and Community Forestry and Forest Health Programs.
	#3	High administrative costs. Clarify deliverables tie to the State Forest Action Plan.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-142	#1	No State Forester signature. High indirect costs. Partners are listed on the proposal but will be "invited" to participate later; not a true partnership. May be funded under forest health management also.
	#2	"Issues/Threats" connection seems weak. No indication of how the proposed "regionwide coordinated effort" would occur. Unclear who would "craft a regional urban forest management strategy" or be part of it, if that's a "measurable Result and Outcome."
	#3	High administrative costs. Clarify deliverables tie to the State Forest Action Plan.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-143	#1	Strong application.
	#2	Should be a Forest Health project. Unclear which parts/subgrants are being funded from this proposal. Appears to essentially duplicate IL-210. Budget doesn't seem to add up and align with narrative expenditures on subgrants. Project not well articulated or explained.
	#3	Good collaboration and leverage. Overall, good project.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-145	#1	Decent project. Needs more defined outcomes.
	#2	Project poorly articulated. Cites "regional land use planning" as an issue but this project doesn't address that (nor "decline of forestry professionals", "managed forests", "fish and wildlife habitat", or "climate change", all cited). Targeted communities do not meet definition of "underserved." Simply those they haven't reached yet.
	#3	Too general. Need more information on priority communities.
	#4	Better tie to State Forest Action Plan subgrant monitoring. Needs more details.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-146	#1	Only identifying Issues and Priorities by number (from publications reviewers don't have) makes it hard to understand or recognize the issue. Seems like a high-cost project for only 20 acres planted and 600 homeowners reached.
	#2	Considerable variation in volunteer rates. Budget table error.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-210	#1	Strong and well-presented application.
	#2	Duplicate of IL-143 with sections slightly reorganized. Should be a Forest Health project (EAB). Unrealistic budget request for one State and one project.
	#3	Pricey but large area, many communities. Multiple subgrants. Many partners, supporters.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IN-170		None given
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IN-171	#1	Good project.
	#2	No connection to "priority areas" or "landscapes." Duplicates work done by the U.S. Forest Service on WebDET/SMART. Charts do not show "demand," only demographics; don't support need. Unclear what they are "contracting" for or with whom. Role of "partners" is unclear. Budget/match numbers don't line up.
	#3	Strong stewardship emphasis.
	#4	National program already under development.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IN-172	#1	Needs more concrete outcomes.
	#2	Better explanation of outcomes/expected result.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IN-175	#1	Good outcomes. Needs more collaboration/leverage.
	#2	No partner letter of support.
	#3	Need better tie to State Forest Action Plan priority landscapes. Budget table error.
	#4	Table 2 not properly completed.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IN-176	#1	OK project. Needs deliverables beyond BMPs. Implementation?
	#2	Good project at low cost. Good value. Problems with budget tables. Table 1 shows Cooperator's Share as \$42,000, but Table 2 shows Cooperator's Contributions summing to \$84,000 (was match 1X or 2X?). IDNR contribution probably is "in-kind" and not really "cash."

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IN-177	#1	Can this be considered under Forest Health? Proposal is long. Identical error to proposal above (is match \$99,000 or \$198,000?).
	#2	Lot of overlap with IN-176, which is a much better proposal. Project seems to offer little to entice private landowner participation. Budget doesn't appear correct here either (same as IN-176). Match doesn't align and IDNR contribution is probably "in-kind" not "cash."
	#3	Invasive control on private land adjacent to State Forests. Good outreach.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IN-178	#1	Should be considered under forest health management.
	#2	700K acres surveyed. Methods not clear.
	#3	Equipment costs for Forest Service share appear high and are unexplained in text of proposal.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MA-101	#1	Is it OK to do this inventory work on State lands (authority)? Is it research?
	#2	FIA project. Potential conflict in authorities.
	#3	This is a forest inventory project. No measurable outcome.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MA-104	#1	Should be considered under forest health management.
	#2	Improve role of cooperators and budget details.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-198	#1	Good idea for project.
	#2	Good project. Interesting concept. Applicability and transferability potential high. They mention "Chesapeake Bay Watershed" but show no connection to Chesapeake Bay strategic plan, priorities, or issues. Indirect costs at 34% are high.
	#3	Course materials and information packets, distributed through brokers. Pilot program.
	#4	Lacks any measure of result on land. Good step toward changing landowner attitude.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-199	#1	Excellent match. Need is there for this grant.
	#2	Concerned about the legality of giving trees, paid for with Federal funds, directly to private homeowners for planting in their own yards (not on public ROW or property). BIG ticket project. May be too big for available funding and in light of other needs and applications.
	#3	Needs better tie to State Forest Action Plan priority landscapes. Improve budget description.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-200	#1	Important to have spatial data. Not sure of residual benefits of the project.
	#2	Addresses data gaps needed for the State Forest Action Plan. Forest Inventory and Analysis involved.
	#3	Forest Inventory and Analysis data layer project. Potential conflict in authorities.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-201	#1	Very targeted project.
	#2	Need better tie to communities at risk in the State Forest Action Plan.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-202	#1	Excellent proposal for expanding chestnut curriculum in schools.
	#2	Focus seems to be on chestnut, but where is any connection to the American Chestnut Foundation or anyone doing chestnut restoration research? Not evident. Target school system already seems to have a well-established program. Might be better to move on to one in greater need. Replicate elsewhere. Past investments don't count as "leverage." Shouldn't count teacher time as "match" if the grant is paying them for it (stipend).
	#3	Need better tie to priority landscapes in the State Forest Action Plan.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-203	#1	Good collaboration. Would like to see more concrete deliverables besides technical assistance.
	#2	Not much "partnership." NWTF is just a contractor. Maryland Forestry is already there. NRCS is just along for the ride.
	#3	Doesn't lead to leveraged money. Seems to be normal program of work – just increased.
	#4	Strong stewardship objective with NRCS.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-206	#1	Excellent and timely effort for urban wood utilization.
	#2	Good job on collaboration and defining issues and threats. The outcomes were a good return for the Federal investment.
	#3	High administrative costs. No Ohio or Pennsylvania State Forester support.
	#4	Pennsylvania and Ohio concurrence missing.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MD-207	#1	Needs better outcomes.
	#2	Bit weak on measurable results and outcomes.
	#3	Appears to be information gathering only – does not lead to an MD program or guidelines. Synthesizing other States.
	#4	Outcomes on land not visible in RFP.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-ME-105	#1	Collaboration section could have been more specific in identifying collaborators.
	#2	Hiring of a forest product "circuit rider" – no tangible accomplishment identified.
	#3	Potential conflict with S&PF authorities. Deliverables not well defined.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-ME-106	#1	Needs more concrete outcomes.
	#2	Timeline was not adequate. The grant was good at describing what would be considered outcomes and results but did not provide specific numbers to those outcomes. As a reviewer that is an almost fatal flaw.
	#3	Need breakdown of contractual expenses, better tie to State Forest Action Plan.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-ME-107	#1	Outcomes were significant but measurable results were not well identified.
	#2	Good project BUT – would not finance any aspect that WebDET/SMART also does. That is our corporate investment.
	#3	Need tie to priority landscapes, national initiative under development.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-ME-109	#1	Several States were identified as benefiting from this project but only New Hampshire sent a letter of support. Abstract almost twice the allowed number of words.
	#2	Better as an Evaluation/Monitoring project. Paying for Northern Research Station staff? Where are the Forest Service dollars going? CONCERN: Multiple States, but not coded as a multistate proposal??
	#3	Research oriented. Missing some State concurrences.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-ME-110	#1	Good outcomes. Can we cost share with loggers with S&PF funds?
	#2	Match needs to be available at time of award – assuming an ANTICIPATED \$480K.
	#3	Compelling need but no NA S&PF authority to fund.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-ME-111	#1	No plan for continuation after the grant period.
	#2	Good job of specifying results and providing measurable outcomes. Seemed like a good project for the modest Federal investment.
	#3	Budget errors. Potential conflict with authorities.
	#4	Education program. Need better explanation of expected change as a result of the effort.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MI-050	#1	No letters of support from listed partners. Outreach component is not strong but the program may be replicable.
	#2	Match must be separate from core in-kind.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MI-051	#1	Excellent partnership and leverage possibilities; however, is the plan to replicate? List out priority issues.
	#2	Communities are identified as "collaborators" but there's no apparent "landscape plan" or "collaboration." Unclear how "priority communities" were determined. Unclear if tree planting will be on public lands. Would have to be using public funds (?).
	#3	UCF. Urban trees to 20 communities. Improve canopy cover.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MI-088	#1	More of a core mission project rather than a grant.
	#2	I think the project is important but the link to priority issues is weak. Not sure if high personnel costs are appropriate.
	#3	3 years to inventory all State Forest access roads. Appropriate?
	#4	Potential conflict with S&PF authorities on public lands. High administrative costs.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MI-148	#1	Unclear on outcomes/objectives.
	#2	Bit unclear on how landowners would be selected for green certification.
	#3	50K acres of private woodland certified. Methods and timeline not clear.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MI-150	#1	Is EAB still a major issue here? Can we make a difference?
	#2	I think this project should be funded in forest health management.
	#3	EAB restoration initiative in Detroit. Ongoing project, final phase. 300K public trees.
	#4	Project location not well defined. Need tie to State Forest Action Plan landscapes.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MI-152	#1	Good follow-through on deliverables.
	#2	Project location not well defined. Need tie to State Forest Action Plan landscapes.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-048	#1	OK project, but needs more outcomes (control).
	#2	Missed opportunity to create "local response teams" or "landscape plan." No partnerships exist or created. No real community engagement. Not convinced these oriental bittersweet infestations are high enough Area-wide priority, in light of other needs. Might this better fit as Forest Health?
	#3	Forest Health invasive plants.
	#4	Need better description of deliverables.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-078	#1	Focus on workshops. More solid outcomes.
	#2	Good workshop development idea.
	#3	No explanation of salary. No expected change or outcome on the land is described.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-079	#1	Significant third party match.
	#2	Good approach to addressing the State Forest Action Plan.
	#3	Contractual work needs better definition; verify not core match.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-080	#1	Good use of landscape stewardship approach.
	#2	Contractual work needs better definition. Priority landscapes in State Forest Action Plan.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-081	#1	Weak link to State Forest Action Plan. Research?
	#2	This application seems to be more of a research project.
	#3	Research.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-082	#1	Excellent method to increase private lands stewardship.
	#2	Poorly written: "This proposal magnetizes that partnership"??? Proposal doesn't seem to address issue cited: lack of MNDNR foresters to write (free) Forest Stewardship plans and sign up Tree Farms. Scope of work and timeline don't indicate what contractual funds would be used for. Match not evident. Only proposed from hoped-for future grants.
	#3	Potential conflict with authorities. Deliverables not quantitative.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-083	#1	Focus on workshops. Weak on outcomes.
	#2	Good partnership.
	#3	Expensive way to sustain volunteer effort.
	#4	High cost for workshops. Equipment and salary not well explained.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-084	#1	Should be using U.S. Forest Service product, WebDET/SMART, instead of creating new Oracle-based system. Budget doesn't seem to align with proposed work plan.
	#2	Landscape stewardship pilot project. Continuation of ongoing. Strong link to State Forest Action Plan.
	#3	Appears to have a degree of redundancy with SMART.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-086	#1	Good ideas on publicity.
	#2	Ongoing project with multiple partners.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MN-087	#1	Decent project. Needs more concrete outcomes.
	#2	Seems like a lot of volunteer time is used as match.
	#3	Need more budget detail. Link to State Forest Action Plan priority landscapes.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MO-191	#1	No "landscape plan" or collaboration with any other partners indicated. No landowners or community engagement. Just focuses same old 1-on-1 assistance in a TNC-identified geographic region. More of an "open-space conservation" project as TNC seems mostly interested in using this project to buy conservation easements.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MO-192	#1	Good project. Links to the State Forest Action Plan could be stronger.
	#2	Ineligible applicant (private, for-profit business). Significant "partial" urban tree canopy already completed. Should be adequate to project priorities for local planting projects. Further urban tree canopy doesn't seem warranted at this time.
	#3	Good workflow. Need for "baseline" not convincing.
	#4	Large part of Federal grant is for personnel.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MO-193	#1	Like the mobile app component more than the risk assessment.
	#2	Ineligible applicant (private, for-profit business). Also, should be Forest Health (EAB) project. FHTET has already done EAB risk mapping. No apparent community involvement. Missouri not that high a priority for this EAB project, at this time, anyway.
	#3	Statewide EAB susceptibility survey. Methods not clear.
	#4	Lack of awareness of – does not appear to build upon existing work in this area.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MO-194	#1	Good project. Combination of applied and technical, and could provide options for participants. Letters of support from partners?
	#2	Addresses wood utilization in Missouri. Methods and measurables not clear.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MO-195	#1	Too much focus on plans.
	#2	Unclear on long-term tangible results.
	#3	Statewide stewardship initiative. Outreach coordinator position.
	#4	Outreach position match needs separation for core match.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MO-196	#1	Focused outcomes.
	#2	OK project – small focus area.
	#3	Contractual budget and deliverables need additional clarification.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-Multi-MD-208	#1	Innovative and exciting concept. Broad partner support.
	#2	Should be a WERC project, not Redesign. Premise that low-income, inner-city, apartment-dwelling residents will early adopt woodstove technology, be able to afford or use it, or be seen as "leaders" is highly questionable. Don't see any "decathlon" aspects to this technology design competition.
	#3	This seems more appropriate for DOE-funded research. Unsure of S&PF funding applicability.
	#4	WERC-like – difficult to make existing authorities connection.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-Multi-NH-019	#1	Useful project. Budget tables do not match. Very useful project.
	#2	Good inventory/evaluation. Some management actions needed.
	#3	This seems more appropriate for DOE-funded research.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-Multi-NH-020	#1	Not sure where the match is coming from. Budget table 1 is wrong. No letters of support. Like the concept of the program.
	#2	Need to show collaboration. Show better connection between work and outcomes.
	#3	WERC-like – difficult to make existing authorities connection.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-Multi-PA-112	#1	This is a good product. Worth the cost, however? Fringe and indirect charges are high. Not much "collaboration" evident. Can't count previous investments as "leverage" for this grant. Cornell (the "contractor") is also listed as a "cooperator"? Unclear: exactly what is their "contribution"?
	#2	High administrative costs. Budget needs clarification on support and State breakdown.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-Multi-VT-056	#1	Innovative "green jobs" project. Very diverse group of partners.
	#2	Outcomes do not appear to be well defined or tangible.
	#3	Sounds like a WERC proposal. Unsure of authorities.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NH-089	#1	Needs more outcomes beyond just workshops.
	#2	Cash match was a real bonus to this proposal.
	#3	Need additional budget breakdown. Deliverable ownership question.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NH-092	#1	Not signed by the State Forester. Significantly linked to the State Forest Action Plan.
	#2	Not very substantive.
	#3	Some parts sound like methods development. Very high Federal personnel costs.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NH-093	#1	Good idea for project. Might need more followup on outcomes.
	#2	Good. Could lead to increase in forest management statewide.
	#3	Indirect costs not explained. Very high Federal personnel costs.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NH-181	#1	State lands only – little extension to private lands. Although they indicate a Demo – there is no actual demo in THIS project. Primarily GIS and assessment. All planning and assessment.
	#2	High administrative costs. Project on public lands has authority issue.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-123	#1	Is this legitimate demonstration work on State lands?
	#2	Target lands are already "protected" or in public ownership. No real gain here. Why isn't FSC certification worth doing for TNC without Federal grant subsidy? (Rutgers does not have a "forestry" program or "forestry students." At least not according to SAF.) Unclear where match funds are coming from or going to. New Jersey State contribution is probably actually "in-kind," not "cash."
	#3	Low score for priority issue – already protected. 38 acres. Increased systematic approach to management across properties. FSC certification.
	#4	TNC-led initiative. Good measurables include 38,000 acres and management plans for 7 large properties.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-124	#1	Large component of match aimed at volunteers.
	#2	Need better tie to State Forest Action Plan priority landscapes, better documentation of in-kind match.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-126	#1	This seemed like a very good project. If the acres of invasive species control would have been included or at least more identifiable it would have scored higher.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-127	#1	Bit unsure on the future deliverables.
	#2	High-priority area with potential for regional benefits beyond New Jersey lines. Strong stakeholder engagement and collaboration (hopefully!). Minimal "leverage" with only New Jersey Forestry involved. Probably the greatest need for New Jersey now.
	#3	Potential conflict with authorities. Need clarification of in-kind match.
	#4	Show some anticipated outcome or change as a result of the work.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-129	#1	Unclear what the specific deliverables/outcomes are. Format?
	#2	Solid application.
	#3	In-kind match from subgrant recipients needs clarification, tie to priority landscapes.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-130	#1	Format? Outcomes not well defined.
	#2	Absence of the Measureable Results & Significant Outcomes, Collaboration, and Leverage sections of the grant proposal significantly detracted from this proposal.
	#3	Need clarification on in-kind match; should tie to priority landscapes in the State Forest Action Plan.
	#4	No support letters and somewhat unclear connection with State Plans.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-131	#1	Format? Needs better defined outcomes.
	#2	Better definition of outreach and deliverables. Symposium match based on attendance.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-132	#1	Like the idea and would be interested in seeing the results.
	#2	Absence of the Measureable Results & Significant Outcomes, Collaboration, and Leverage sections of the grant proposal significantly detracted from this proposal.
	#3	Develop tools to expedite i-Tree surveys and respond to storm events. Methods, deliverables not clear.
	#4	Need to tie to State Forest Action Plan priority landscapes. Subgrant match variable.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-024	#1	Show some anticipated outcome or change as a result of the work.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-025	#1	OK project.
	#2	High indirect costs. Good approach to introducing children to all aspects of forestry early.
	#3	Printing costs, primarily. Good pub and distribution – 400K copies of each issue.
	#4	Three 8-page newsletters for \$126K plus match – very expensive. 6-month development time for newsletter seems excessive.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-026	#1	Can this grant be considered under Forest Health? Good leverage. Excellent outcomes section and train-the-trainer approach extends outreach of the grant.
	#2	Need more specifics on what the change will be as a result of these workshops; should be measurable.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-029	#1	Need to tie to State Forest Action Plan priority landscapes. Subgrant match variable.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-030	#1	Forest health treatment project?
	#2	Need to tie to State Forest Action Plan priority landscapes. HWA Treatment category in RFP.
	#3	Seems like this should be under the Forest Health category.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-031	#1	Accomplishments seemed a little sparse over a 2-year period.
	#2	No comment.
	#3	High administrative cost. Need clarification of deliverables.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-032	#1	High administrative costs. Potential conflict with authorities.
	#2	Business start-up?
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-035	#1	Good inventory/evaluation. Some management actions needed.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-037	#1	Could use more clearly defined outcomes.
	#2	This proposal spent way too much space discussing past accomplishments of NYRP and not enough space specifying specific accomplishments that would be achieved with the investment of Federal dollars. A draft goals table was included but no reference that these goals would be a measurable outcome of the project. There were no specific leverage or collaboration sections within the grant, so as a reviewer I had to infer the leverage and collaboration based upon the budget table and the partners listing. This proposal needs more specifics on accomplishments and timeline. [This reviewer was clearly turned off by the highly branded campaign and commercial sponsors.]
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-040	#1	\$217,000 of the budgeted match is listed as pending. This led to the low leverage score. Because this grant budget does not meet the 50:50 requirement, it should be disqualified.
	#2	Potential match issue. Clarification on contractor deliverable.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-041	#1	Potential match issue. Equipment funds issue.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-042	#1	Banking on ANTICIPATED match – without the AFF grant, does not meet the 1:1 match.
	#2	Match issue. In-kind services need to be separate of core match.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-070	#1	Good project. More specifics on outcomes.
	#2	Forest Service contractual costs need clarification. Potential conflict with authorities.
	#3	Show estimates of change expected from workshops.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-182	#1	Good leverage, good partnerships, good discussion of the issues. Specific outcomes and measurable (countable) results for the Federal funding were vague to nonexistent. Timeline was also vague.
	#2	Could have quantified better. Multiple States – NY, NJ, PA – but not multistate??
	#3	Concerns from review team.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-OH-096	#1	This is an old program initiative and should be part of the State's ongoing program.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-OH-097	#1	High staff cost. Where will the work be done? Need to define outcomes better.
	#2	Good project, but not sure of authority – SPCH for invasive plants, possibly combination of fuels reduction and invasives. Regeneration cut (mechanically cut) is concerning.
	#3	High administrative costs. Land ownership needs to be identified as public or private.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-OH-099	#1	Don't feel it's an appropriate role for the Ohio DNR to become chain-of-custody auditor, as the proposal appears to suggest. Seems c-of-c group certification is already available (or executed imminently) in the region through Center for Forest and Wood Certification. Can't count past investments (OH's SF certification) as "leverage" for this project. Budget/match question: is the Ohio DNR contribution actually "cash"? Or, more likely, "in-kind"?
	#2	High administrative costs. Public land ownership for stewardship funds issue.
	#3	Show some anticipated outcomes. Questionable use of stewardship authority.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-Outside-MD-197	#1	I liked this project. The problem I see is that the leverage of \$700,000 is "expected." This would be OK but that same \$700,000 is used for match. If the expected leverage of donated land value does not come through, the grant is short \$143,000 in required match. \$143,000 in guaranteed match is worth more than \$700,000 in "expected" donations.
	#2	Virginia should be seeking funds from the Southern Region, not NA S&PF. Question using public funds to pay for private easement surveys and appraisals. Legal to use public funds to buy and plant trees on private property? Budget numbers and tables don't match up at all. Adjusted score = 40. Good idea but needs work.
	#3	Are easements outside of our authority?
	#4	Confusing presentation. Connections to the State Forest Action Plan are weak. Match is not in-hand. Easement match may not be allowable even if in-hand due to authority constraints. SPST cannot be used for easement incentives.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-PA-117	#1	The grant listed what criteria would be used to determine success; however, it failed to provide specific measurable outcomes. For example, how many volunteers would be educated? How many volunteers will be first detectors? etc.
	#2	Budget clarification needed. Deliverables need clarification.
	#3	Explain the expected change for invasives. Not clear as to the match.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-PA-118	#1	Timely and relevant issue across the country.
	#2	The Pennsylvania Invasive Species Council should have already done this work or should be doing it. Sounds like the applicant expects to be "directing" the PA DCNR. Not their role. Minimal collaboration and leverage evident.
	#3	Weak cost-share/match – organizations participating in interviews/surveys. Okay, otherwise.
	#4	Does not mention the Department of Agriculture and its invasive plant responsibilities.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-052	#1	Very internally focused project.
	#2	Builds talent and capacity and develops strategic action.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-054	#1	Interesting approach to participation in carbon markets. Good replication possibility and outcomes in proposal.
	#2	Carbon market viability not clear, nor impact of project.
	#3	Show better how carbon markets will change the trend in forest management.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-055	#1	Need definition of contractual match. Deliverables need definition.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-057	#1	Good project.
	#2	Good project (UCF). Building from a strategic plan. Substantive, highly leveraged.
	#3	Unsure of contractual costs.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-058	#1	Proposal did not provide enough significant outcomes. It could have addressed collaboration and leverage with much more detail.
	#2	Potential issue on authorities. Deliverables need definition.
	#3	WERC proposal?
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-060	#1	I don't see a clear link back to the State Forest Action Plan.
	#2	Good project. Cross-boundary management.
	#3	Match issue. Deliverables need better definition.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-061		None provided

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-062	#1	Excellent timeline in proposal.
	#2	Duplicate project exists in Missouri (forest keepers). Deliverables need clarification.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-063	#1	Innovative project.
	#2	The project's specifics are innovative.
	#3	Match issue. Issue with potential conflict of authorities.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-064	#1	Actions and objectives should be more closely related. Need clearer presentation of objectives.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-VT-066	#1	Potential issue with authorities. Match needs additional details.
	#2	Unclear of authorities and ties to State [Forest Action] Plan.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-156	#1	Challenging proposal to rate. Do all areas need to be managed...i.e. steep slopes, islands, etc.?
	#2	Not highest and best use of NA S&PF funds.
	#3	Potential issue on authorities. Deliverables need definition equipment purchase.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-157	#1	Letters of support would clarify the roles of each of the partners listed.
	#2	Congressional outreach a problem. Measures weak.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-158	#1	Big cost and very high fringe and indirect, but still a good, well-explained proposal with a clear, desired result. Probably best written of all I reviewed.
	#2	No letters of support.
	#3	Very high indirect. Has to be Fire – not Stewardship or FHP.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-159	#1	Interesting partnership opportunity to get more private lands certified.
	#2	Proposal very detailed and clearly written. Excellent partnerships in place with leveraged funding. Budget tables and match numbers don't seem to align.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-160	#1	Heavy on workshops.
	#2	A little weak on measurable results.
	#3	Potential issue on authorities. Budget and deliverables lacking.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-162	#1	Technical assistance to schools considering biomass heat systems. Four feasibility studies. Proposal, timeline well written.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-163	#1	Unclear on marketing deliverables.
	#2	I like the messaging idea promoting reforestation opportunities.
	#3	Potential issue on authorities. Potential core match issue for in-kind services.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-164	#1	Research/methods development?
	#2	Appears to be strictly an internal research project with minimal outreach, collaboration, or technology transfer. No leveraging evident. Question how high a priority this particular disease is in the big picture.
	#3	Method/research focus. Need verification of in-kind match.
	#4	Very high Federal personnel costs. Potential for methods development?
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WI-165	#1	It would be better to clearly list out and link the connections to State, regional, and national plans. Good proposal.
	#2	Very weak connection to the State Forest Action Plan.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-011	#1	Good proposal would be even better if the utilities helped with the match.
	#2	Good project. Demonstrates impact of trees.
	#3	Connection to the State Forest Action Plan is unclear – what are funds used for?
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-013	#1	Incorrect format. Budget not clear and doesn't make sense. Poorly written. Never say who will do what, or how project will get done. Seems improbable to succeed.
	#2	Potential issue on authorities. Budget detail lacking. High administrative costs.
	#3	Show better link to stewardship.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-014	#1	Incorrect format. Wordy with insufficient meaningful detail. Duplicates existing work of the U.S. Forest Service National Woodland Owner Survey and TELE project. Never say who will do work. Budget not right. "Cash" from West Virginia Division of Forestry more likely "in-kind"?
	#2	Budget detail lacking. High administrative costs.
	#3	No reference to the State Forest Action Plan. No reference to SFRI or TELE.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-015	#1	Incorrect format. Poorly written. No focus. Unsubstantiated statements. No collaboration or partnership with intended beneficiaries – West Virginia forest industries. Budget not clear and doesn't make sense. Never say who will do what, or how project will get done.
	#2	3-year interagency partnership to develop marketing plan for West Virginia Forest Products Industry. Well thought out and described.
	#3	High administrative costs. Need tie to priority landscapes in the State Forest Action Plan.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-016	#1	Deliverables aren't clear.
	#2	Good project. Cost efficient and large return on investment. Using LandServer – building on success.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-017	#1	Good project with potential for replication and success. Demonstrations at the parcel level.
	#2	Weak connection to the State Forest Action Plan. Low cost:benefit ratio.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-018	#1	No specific timeline.
	#2	Partnership with a State college. Develop curriculum. Teacher workshops.
	#3	1 workshop – why does this take 3 years? Poor cost:benefit ratio.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-023	#1	Incorrect format. Should be a Fire project. Budget problems ("cash" vs. "in-kind"?).
	#2	Match issue of in-kind conflict with core match and landowner potential.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-043	#1	Unsure of solid measureable metrics.
	#2	Good blend of stewardship and forest health objectives.
	#3	Deliverables need better definition. Need in-kind separation from core.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-044	#1	Incorrect format. Poorly written and described. Information already widely available on the Internet. No collaboration with target audience or leverage shown.
	#2	High administrative costs. Need tie to priority landscapes in the State Forest Action Plan.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-046	#1	Incorrect format. Seems like a low-priority project with low prospects for benefits. No connection to targeted areas or indication they are aware, interested, supportive, or engaged.
	#2	Budget issue with contractual costs. Potential conflict with authorities.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-047	#1	Good outreach messaging idea.
	#2	Paying for workshops and cataloging – not many deliverables...but not bad.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-067	#1	Interesting proposal. Would spruce be another alternative to replant?
	#2	Incorrect format. Should be Forest Health or Forest Health Methods proposal. Very concerned about the appropriateness and viability of choosing Eastern white pine – an intolerant species – to underplant in hemlock-dominant riparian areas. Doesn't seem suited for this study.
	#3	No quantified area. Demonstrations. No authority to assist (financially) with harvesting.
	#4	Methods development?
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-073	#1	Good partnership proposal.
	#2	Incorrect format. Adjusted score = 10. Much of the target area is outside West Virginia and outside NA S&PF. The Southern Region should be tapped for funding there. No scope of work or timeline presented. Unclear who will do what, when. No "team" or "partners" appear to be engaged.
	#3	Need additional budget information. Leverage funds not well identified.

FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Redesign

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-WV-154	#1	Poorly explained (i.e., what or who is "Synergy in Motion" or "Synergy in Action"?). Unclear how teachers will be recruited or why they will come. Looks a lot like Project Learning Tree, but doesn't seem to coordinate or work with that established program. Why? No real or plausible connection between training teachers and increasing Tree Farm enrollment or Forest Stewardship Plan completion for forest owners.
	#2	Proposes two summer training events. Measurable outcomes are thin beyond workshops/trainings held.