

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-IA-005     | #1       | Well written. Small survey but large outreach efforts.   |
|                 | #2       | More partners should be included, more outreach events and survey for the funds requested.   |
|                 | #3       | A lot of money for just surveying 146 trees.   |
|                 | #4       | Budget of \$75,000 per year for a survey of 146 trees plus 3 workshops seems a bit steep. Are personnel costs on the Federal side of the budget for temporary help or full-time staff? This may help to explain budget size. |
|                 | #5       | OK. Expensive.   |
|                 | #6       | 146 trees surveyed and 3 workshops. High C:B ratio.  |
|                 | #7       | No measureable outcomes.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-OH-095     | #1       | Should have provided discussion of specific actions to be measured and reported. I didn't see a scale of this project (how many acres being restored?) so it was hard to evaluate cost/benefit.                              |
|                 | #2       | Restoration very important. Clearer description of how funds will be used.   |
|                 | #3       | Clarify activities in project and who will do the activity. Explain "other" in budget for \$201,482. How will it be used as EQIP funds?  |
|                 | #4       | Forest Health grant money should not be used for replanting efforts.   |
|                 | #5       | Not appropriate to fund here – this is restoration in wake of ALB – not within Forest Health authorities. Even in Redesign, not clearly within S&PF authorities since this is a practice (EQIP) proposal.                    |
|                 | #6       | Focus on riparian and urban restoration. APHIS could leverage more funding than the Forest Service while ALB is regulated.   |
|                 | #7       | No measureable outcomes. Need to describe how many acres and landowners will potentially benefit and overall expected change.  |
|                 | #8       | This is a Stewardship/UCF proposal.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-----------------|----------|---|
| FY12-MA-102     | #1       | Well-written proposal providing good detail and identifying value. Question is: does the Forest Service consider this a Forest Health Methods (Applied Technology) proposal that is excluded from this RFP but would be appropriate under a separate Forest Service solicitation that is coming? Is it a proven technology? |
|                 | #2       | Good proposal. ALB survey with traps to detect/regulate/slow the spread within and outside the State. No Table 2 information, though.   |
|                 | #3       | Collaboration – focus on municipalities and how they will participate. Forest Service Seasonal is not explained and might circulate U.S. Forest Service funds through the State back to U.S. Forest Service employees.  |
|                 | #4       | This project is a critical first step in the operational use of the new ALB lure and trap. Project is needed to help detect ALB in forested situations. Are the lure and trap ready for operational use? Appears 3 years are needed to collect sufficient data on the current threat.                                       |
|                 | #5       | New technology. Borders on applied technology, but has been field tested – highly replicable. At some point, needs to move from methods/applied technology to application. This is a good situation to use. Build in flexibility for adjustment.  |
|                 | #6       | Good to do with benefits beyond Massachusetts. Not a methods project.   |
|                 | #7       | Need better projected results. Explain what is new that will make a difference with ALB.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-CT-186     | #1       | Continuation of previous work is good. Proposal is lean on detail related to partnerships and tie to State Forest Action Plan.   |
|                 | #2       | ALB is not a Buprestid. Like that you are building on previous zip code survey work to target outreach efforts. Assume you are doing ALB survey work, too. Not real clear.   |
|                 | #3       | Purpose should be stated more directly. Abstract has closest statement to a purpose.   |
|                 | #4       | Personnel costs on the Federal side: for temporary help or full-time staff? How are partners, like the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, involved with this survey? Important survey considering nearby infestation of ALB in Massachusetts. Very cost efficient. |
|                 | #5       | Builds from earlier work – don't move firewood continuation – 2nd homes included.  |
|                 | #6       | Lacks details on design.   |
|                 | #7       | Weak proposal. No real measurable outcomes.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-IA-006     | #1       | Not sure this is in the right category – feels like it was more focused on urban forestry inventory...with EAB outreach thrown in.   |
|                 | #2       | Good use of partners.  |
|                 | #3       | Budget doesn't explain how money will be spent and by who. Street tree monitoring should be an urban forestry grant proposal.  |
|                 | #4       | Personnel costs in the Federal budget: for temporary staff or full-time staff? Seems a bit expensive for survey work for 2 years and producing 45 plans. How will visual surveys be conducted? Not described.  |
|                 | #5       | More "UCF" inventory purpose than EAB. "Redesign"  |
|                 | #6       | Inventory to identify high-risk communities. Emphasis on increasing species diversity, ash replacement.  |
|                 | #7       | Cost is high for the project. Need more detail about the relationship of actions to results.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-NY-036     | #1       | A lot of words that covered many different approaches that would be conducted but they were not clearly described in a succinct, easy to follow narrative – it felt a bit jumbled or scattershot.  |
|                 | #2       | Comprehensive, multifaceted statewide proposal for EAB.  |
|                 | #3       | Need to explain how this project's funds and Lancaster project funds will be used – cooperatively.   |
|                 | #4       | The SLAM Demo project in Michigan is not complete yet; this project proposes to duplicate the SLAM project in NY. Need to first determine if the Michigan project works. Otherwise, this is a very good attempt to use the known management tools to slow ash mortality down. The \$100,000 in contractual in the Federal budget: what is it being used for?   |
|                 | #5       | Good project.  |
|                 | #6       | Hard to get towns to do ash management plans ahead of Slow The Spread work.  |
|                 | #7       | No comment on project, but need to explain equipment needs.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-NY-038     | #1       | Cooperator contributions are hard to follow, with not a lot of detail on partner roles provided. The representation of the match was not clear. I believe the 1:1 is provided but it was not represented in a clear manner and needs to be confirmed.  |
|                 | #2       | Way too many pages. Five-page limit proposal not stand alone without additional "see" sections. Also, budget not clear. Table 1 cooperator share \$135.762K. Table 2 adds up to \$354K.  |
|                 | #3       | This may be a Redesign project because it encompasses Urban Forestry and Forest Health.  |
|                 | #4       | The \$196,000 in personnel costs in the Federal budget: who is being paid? Temporary staff or full-time staff? Proposal states funds will go to communities for treatments, but this is not discussed in the proposal and no FSM3400 was submitted for treatments. The plans to be developed are clearly described but not treatments or reforestation, which are not addressed. Good project if it was just the plans to help communities, but other aspects in the proposal are not addressed. |
|                 | #5       | Submitted in wrong category – should have been Redesign – would have ranked higher in Redesign. Seems more appropriate as an urban project.  |
|                 | #6       | Agree in concept but map/detail needed.  |
|                 | #7       | Need to give more explanation to expected outcomes; very weak.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-NY-039     | #1       | Well-written detailed proposal that is thorough and thoughtful. Pulled in multiple partners and creates a model (template) for others to use. Work will continue after this grant.   |
|                 | #2       | Nice project, but no title. Didn't use template, which made it harder to review. No Table 2. No DUNS/EIN.  |
|                 | #3       | This should be combined with New York SLAM project. Improve measureable results.   |
|                 | #4       | Needed to follow the grant application template. What is the timeline? Is this a 1-year project? Otherwise, this is a good local proposal to deal with EAB. Proposal needs to address the treatment aspects mentioned in greater detail. |
|                 | #5       | Would have been more competitive in the Redesign category due to the heavy urban influence/component; only a portion is appropriate for EAB.   |
|                 | #6       | Expensive – not a "model."   |
|                 | #7       | No outcomes; very weak proposal.   |
|                 | #8       | Suppression of EAB within a regulated area is questionable.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-MN-049     | #1       | Have heard via staff attendance at meetings that thinning ash stands is not recommended now. Heavier ash resource limits spread (in pockets instead of throughout thinned stand). Might want to check on this.                           |
|                 | #2       | Clearly states how funds will be used within the timeline.   |
|                 | #3       | Good use of partners and cooperators and leveraging other State and municipal funds. Treatments/insecticides need to be described.   |
|                 | #4       | Minneapolis/St. Paul. Several partners. Survey and remove infested trees.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-----------------|----------|---|
| FY12-WV-072     | #1       | While the relative cost was small, the select number of trees to be treated is spread over an eight-county area. The scope and scale of this proposal rated it lower than others based on cost/benefit. |
|                 | #2       | Good value for the funds requested.   |
|                 | #3       | Project should be linked to SLAM and include work on ash tree inventory.  |
|                 | #4       | Project is fine – low cost.   |
|                 | #5       | Chemical treatment for EAB in State parks/trails. Moderate cost – temporary benefit.  |
|                 | #6       | Weak, no support shown for project. Need to explain how to accomplish NEPA.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-PA-114     | #1       | Scale and scope of this proposal were limited and it had to score on its stand-alone merit. Return on investment compared to other proposals was less.  |
|                 | #2       | Improve collaboration and partnerships and show relationship to prior project. Only impacts one land ownership type; show how it impacts other ownership types.   |
|                 | #3       | Good project.   |
|                 | #4       | Up to 600 trees treated area wide. Okay.  |
|                 | #5       | High cost for 630 trees. Technical soundness not clear.   |
|                 | #6       | Redundant proposal. Explain how to accomplish NEPA.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-PA-115     | #1       | Expanding on current work (continuation) is good. The cost compared to other proposals conducting similar work using the same protocols is substantially higher.  |
|                 | #2       | Budget seems high for the planned work.   |
|                 | #3       | Costs for 2 seasonal interns and 2 rental vehicles over a 3-year period are extreme. Costs should be ¼ of what they're stated in the budget page.   |
|                 | #4       | EAB biocontrol not technically proven – where is APHIS?   |
|                 | #5       | Parasitoid release in northern Pennsylvania. Six release sites. High cost.  |
|                 | #6       | Explain the expected outcomes better.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-----------------|----------|---|
| FY12-PA-116     | #1       | The scale and scope for this proposal are small with the concept of treating 600 of 400,000 ash trees. The cost/benefit for this proposal was lower than others. Not a lot about collaboration/partnerships – "will work diligently with other partners."   |
|                 | #2       | This project should be linked to SLAM instead of being a tree removal project. Also include Urban forestry as a partner and consider it for a Redesign project.   |
|                 | #3       | Good protocols. Up to 600 trees treated per year in urban areas.  |
|                 | #4       | Treat 600 trees. Chemical treatments. B:C ratio questionable.   |
|                 | #5       | Redundant proposal. Explain how to accomplish NEPA.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-IL-137     | #1       | Unclear as to what the partner roles/interaction are. FPDCC planting and using GPS to locate trees. Contractual for tree purchase?  |
|                 | #2       | Good to see letter of support.  |
|                 | #3       | Forest Health money should not be used for replanting projects.   |
|                 | #4       | This is a very expensive project to plant 1,500 trees. Need to explain why this project costs over \$600,000.   |
|                 | #5       | UCF tree planting – "Redesign."   |
|                 | #6       | High cost for benefit @ \$400/tree.   |
|                 | #7       | Show the relationship between planting and controlling EAB.   |
|                 | #8       | Tree planting.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-IL-138     | #1       | Liked multiple approaches (evaluation, removal, treatment, bio release). Large overmatch impressive.  |
|                 | #2       | No outreach component to this project.  |
|                 | #3       | Fall treatments with Tree-age should be re-evaluated because treating in the spring is a better time. 18,000 treated trees is a lot. Need to be flexible on what trees to treat because 3 years later you will have to treat all these trees again to keep them alive. Good use of tree treatments, assessment, survey, and biological control. |
|                 | #4       | Not sustainable with repetition over time.  |
|                 | #5       | Suppression/eradication efforts not practical or cost effective.  |
|                 | #6       | How will NEPA be met?   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-----------------|----------|---|
| FY12-MI-149     | #1       | No DUNS/EIN. Felt like this was more for tree harvest method awareness than based on forest health even though EAB was referenced. This might be better suited to Redesign as a forest management tool.   |
|                 | #2       | Good to see partnership with logging interests, letters of support.   |
|                 | #3       | Tree removal work should not be part of forest health grants.   |
|                 | #4       | This is a Redesign project or Methods Development; same as the WI-167 project. Suggest only one of the two projects be considered. The Michigan project is less expensive than the Wisconsin project. Looks more like a Methods Development project and not a Category 3 Forest Health project. Also, appears that this project was already conducted in Wisconsin in 2010. This project proposes to remove dead trees, which is not allowed in the RFP for Category 3 Forest Health proposals. |
|                 | #5       | Good project but more UCF oriented at this stage.   |
|                 | #6       | Good link to State Forest Action Plan. Market for EAB-infested wood?  |
|                 | #7       | Explain how tree removal will control EAB. What is the expected outcome?  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-WI-167     | #1       | Possibly Redesign proposal because it focused primarily on tree harvest/landscape management – mentioned EAB and invasive tree/shrubs for wildlife purposes.  |
|                 | #2       | Well written. Good concept. Helpful detailed budget. Don Peterson works for two different entities and he is leading the project, very confusing. Repeat of project done in 2010 – does it need to be repeated???   |
|                 | #3       | Forest Health grant money should not be used for tree removal.  |
|                 | #4       | This is a Redesign project or Methods Development; same as MI-149. Appears to be both an EAB/Methods Development project and invasive plants project. Would have scored higher as a Redesign project or Methods Development, but not a Category 3 Forest Health project. Also, removal of dead trees is not allowed under Category 3 Forest Health projects.  |
|                 | #5       | Good project but more UCF oriented at this stage.   |
|                 | #6       | Two 5-day workshops. Good collaboration.  |
|                 | #7       | Not a "specific" bug project.   |
|                 | #8       | NOT EAB – Not FHP.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-IN-169     | #1       | No DUNS/EIN. Liked idea of management aimed at landowner awareness of EAB (forest health) impact.  |
|                 | #2       | Budget needs more information on how money will be spent.  |
|                 | #3       | Personnel funding on the Federal budget: for temporary help or full-time staff? Budget not clear on how funds are to be spent, otherwise a very good idea to get forest management programs in place to deal with EAB.   |
|                 | #4       | Employs adaptive forest management. Good B:C ratio. Involves landowners. Well-conceived timeline and objectives.   |
|                 | #5       | Need a better explanation about how restoration control[s] EAB. Better Redesign project.   |
|                 | #6       | This is a Stewardship Authorities Grant.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-IN-173     | #1       | Well written. Lots of stakeholders would benefit. Liked management focus rather than just tree inventory.  |
|                 | #2       | Well written with clear objectives for using funds. Realistic timeline and included letters of support.  |
|                 | #3       | Forest Health money should not be used for tree planting. Should be Redesign grant money.  |
|                 | #4       | This is a Redesign project better suited for Category 1, not Category 3. This is not a single-species project dealing with EAB, but an integrated project that would be better suited under Redesign. This project would have scored close to 100 points for Redesign, but was rated lower under Category 3. |
|                 | #5       | EAB integrated with UCF. More information on landscape needed.   |
|                 | #6       | Indianapolis – high number of urban ash. Employs harvest/market approach. Good partner participation.  |
|                 | #7       | Not a Forest Health project. This is more public works/policy.   |
|                 | #8       | UCF - Not FHP.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number   | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-------------------|----------|---|
| FY12-MD-205       | #1       | Overall a succinct and well-written proposal. A little light on partnership contributions.  |
|                   | #2       | Including a list of outreach events would strengthen this proposal.   |
|                   | #3       | Explain partner role better. Note indicates other funding source[s] – suggest explaining them.  |
|                   | #4       | Additional monetary support for work already being done by the State.   |
|                   | #5       | Question APHIS coordination; effectiveness questionable.  |
|                   | #6       | Borderline research. Use of parasitoid to control EAB spread. Unproven?   |
|                   | #7       | Show a real measure for outcomes; this is more research.  |
| Proposal Number   | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-Multi-IN-209 | #1       | Budget numbers didn't match. Requested \$60K, budget \$76.816K. Liked Webinar approach to target numerous audiences.  |
|                   | #2       | No State Forester signature. Broadens the coverage to several forest pests, not in keeping with the RFP.  |
|                   | #3       | Grant is asking for \$60,000 but budget page says \$76,815 – which is correct? Worthwhile project but budget needs to be clarified.   |
|                   | #4       | Budget information is not clear. Is the request for \$60,000 or for \$76,815? How much funding is going to each university? Need a Table 1 budget for each university. This is a greatly needed service to all States dealing with EAB. |
|                   | #5       | Would like more data on increase in EAB University participation.   |
|                   | #6       | Chemical control of EAB. "EAB University" Web site. Webinars and series of EAB programs.  |
|                   | #7       | Explain better how a management plan will control EAB.  |
|                   | #8       | Budget figures do not track. Not limited to one issue.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number          | Reviewer | Comments   |
|--------------------------|----------|--|
| <b>FY12-Multi-WV-010</b> | #1       | Overall statement on this proposal is that it was light on detail compared to its competition.   |
|                          | #2       | No mention of survey method to be used; [this is] important as focused on the leading edge.  |
|                          | #3       | Explain how this project cannot be done with “base” forest health protection funds that each State receives.   |
|                          | #4       | Budget is not complete – should spell out exactly what the grant money is going to cover.  |
|                          | #5       | PA, WV, OH. Enhanced detection. Looks good.  |
|                          | #6       | Survey of tristate area to determine HWA spread.   |
| Proposal Number          | Reviewer | Comments   |
| <b>FY12-Multi-WV-012</b> | #1       | This proposal, while multistate, provided no collaborative feel in its presentation. It was more each State is treating some trees – not detailing an integrated approach/value. |
|                          | #2       | False statement that chemical treatments are the only option to control HWA, listing a survey method for HWA.  |
|                          | #3       | Clarify budget tables to reflect treatment expense. Thought it would appear under contractual.   |
|                          | #4       | No budget page for New Jersey or Pennsylvania. Budget should spell out exactly what money is going to be spent on.   |
|                          | #5       | PA, WV, MD, NJ. MD appears to be out of line, cost-wise – ~ 3X each of the other States. High costs – appropriate?   |
|                          | #6       | Chemical treatment of high-value hemlock on 2,000 acres in four States. Interstate collaboration.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-NY-027     | #1       | Overall nice proposal – strong partnership and good track record. There has been ongoing funding for this work and that is likely to continue after this grant would be completed.                       |
|                 | #2       | Targeted monitoring/eradication for giant hogweed proposal. Nicely done.   |
|                 | #3       | Have the New York Department of Highways as a partner since photos are of roadside giant hogweed patches. Question – why isn't APHIS funding this project since giant hogweed is a Federal noxious weed? |
|                 | #4       | Very high cost, 1-year proposal for treating 136 acres. High level of Indirect Costs on Federal side of the budget (\$52K). Post-treatment evaluations required.   |
|                 | #5       | Technically sound – know where the giant hogweed is. What is APHIS funding going to? Is this our role since giant hogweed is a noxious weed?   |
|                 | #6       | Broader than "Forest Health."  |
|                 | #7       | High cost and indirect; outcomes not well described.   |
|                 | #8       | Very impressive proposal. Well done.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-----------------|----------|---|
| FY12-NY-028     | #1       | Nice job tying in goals to various plans. Builds on previous work that has been done over time.   |
|                 | #2       | Liked the outreach/education factor, which I think was primarily aimed at EAB. However, this also addressed ALB, which made it a multiple species proposal, which was defined as the Redesign category, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent out requesting proposal submittals.  |
|                 | #3       | Explain how trained people will report pests.   |
|                 | #4       | This is not an Invasive Plants project. It addresses EAB and ALB. This proposal addresses two species and not one, as requested in the RFP for Forest Health Category 3. This proposal should be submitted under Redesign Category 1 as a multiple species proposal. Rated as if it were a Redesign Proposal, not a Forest Health Category 3. Should be removed from Forest Health Category 3 consideration due to multiple species focus. Very good proposal, and has a good approach for outreach and training. |
|                 | #5       | May be okay, but bad fit – should have been Redesign. This is an addendum to a FY11 REDESIGN project.   |
|                 | #6       | Experience in other States suggests limited utility.  |
|                 | #7       | Should be a Redesign project. Explain how actions control the problem.  |
|                 | #8       | Miscategorized – should have been a Redesign submission.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-NY-033     | #1       | The written narrative was not clear and succinct when compared to the competition. The scale/scope of this proposal is small compared to others, which impacted its return on investment evaluation.   |
|                 | #2       | The primary goal is a management plan to conduct inventory, which can be used for forest health issues. Addresses multiple species, which was defined as a Redesign category proposal, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent out requesting proposal submittals. No fund recipient information.                       |
|                 | #3       | Make this an EAB, ALB, and thousand cankers disease (TCD) survey for less funds. Mentioned EAB, ALB, and TCD at first but only talked about EAB.   |
|                 | #4       | This is not an Invasive Plants project. It addresses mainly EAB, but also ALB, TCD, and invasive plants. This is a multispecies proposal and should not be considered under Category 3 Forest Health. Should be considered under Category 1 Redesign.  |
|                 | #5       | Good project – BAD fit – should have been Redesign due to integration of Forest Health efforts.  |
|                 | #6       | Scope of work too broad. Good location.  |
|                 | #7       | Should be a Redesign project. Explain how GIS controls the problem.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-VT-053     | #1       | The proposal described small scattered actions focused on riparian buffers. The cost of the project was high for the scale/scope of work compared to others. Don't know if NRCS might be a better funding source for this work in riparian buffers.  |
|                 | #2       | No DUNS/EIN. Targeted knotweed in riparian areas. Nicely done.   |
|                 | #3       | Clarify budget – Form 3400 asks for \$247+K and budget table shows \$364+K.  |
|                 | #4       | Very well-written proposal that addresses all the criteria requested in the RFP. Could be used as a "model" proposal for others to follow. Vast majority of funding to be used for implementation/contractual – good leverage of other resources. Results could be used by others to develop similar projects in their States. |
|                 | #5       | Good partnership. Disparity between Form 3400 and proposal in amount requested. Possibly training is over \$140K?  |
|                 | #6       | Too broad in scope. Expensive.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-VT-065     | #1       | Proposal plans to leverage small treatment areas to educate and engage a much larger group of resource owners. Could have provided more detail on specific steps that will be taken to make sure you successfully get the participation of the larger adjoining resource owners. |
|                 | #2       | Primarily a stewardship management focus. Addresses multiple species, which was defined as a Redesign category proposal, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent out requesting proposal submittals.  |
|                 | #3       | Clarify budget – Form 3400 asks for \$37+K and budget table shows \$246+K under contractual.   |
|                 | #4       | Very well-written proposal that addresses the criteria outlined in the RFP. Funding used for treatments, contractual, and outreach/training. Good interagency team effort and good leverage of current resources and programs. Good model for others to follow.                  |
|                 | #5       | Proven methods. Good involvement of land managers and landowners in radii around The Nature Conservancy properties.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-MN-076     | #1       | Targeted aerial mapping survey for buckthorn resulting in treatment areas of leading edge (to aid oak regeneration – stewardship – Redesign category?). Clear and well written.  |
|                 | #2       | No signature on proposal.  |
|                 | #3       | Need a better breakdown of how grant money will be spent.  |
|                 | #4       | Very cost-effective 3-year proposal. Good use of aerial survey techniques for invasive plant detection. Technique could be used in other States.   |
|                 | #5       | Buckthorn outcompeting oak. Employ aerial survey to identify invasive areas. Good partnership support.   |
|                 | #6       | This was a pleasure to read. Nicely done.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-NH-091     | #1       | The presentation narrative of this proposal was generally not clearly laid out and would have scored better with more attention to organization and clarity.   |
|                 | #2       | Addresses multiple species, which was defined as a Redesign category proposal, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent out for proposal submittal. Stewardship focus on inventory and managing invasive plants. |
|                 | #3       | This may be a Technology Development project to test IPMDAT. State the purpose of the project better than in the proposal.   |
|                 | #4       | Cost-effective project that addresses needed updates to New Hampshire invasive plants. Focus on priority area.   |
|                 | #5       | Solid protocol. Looks good.  |
|                 | #6       | Weak outcomes. No visible support or collaboration.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-OH-094     | #1       | Liked that this proposal is building off of previous grant funding and that there is a track record of leveraging resources. Also liked that this proposal expands invasive species response capacity in the State.    |
|                 | #2       | Leveraging other funds. Lots of committed partners.  |
|                 | #3       | Goal should be eradication and not suppression. Also suggest that kudzu be declared a pest/pathogen under Ohio plant law if it is not.   |
|                 | #4       | Benefit of passthrough funds not explained enough; a lot of money for minimal outcome.   |
|                 | #5       | Good partnership with the Wayne National Forest. Builds on direct marketing. 2 demonstration areas. Good project.  |
|                 | #6       | Kudzu focus in a CWMA. Good partnership support. Outreach to private landowners. Wayne National Forest.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-----------------|----------|---|
| FY12-PA-113     | #1       | Not sure this proposal fits into this category; doesn't focus on forest pests.  |
|                 | #2       | Show how this will reach beyond the professional and to the landowners. Will professionals be required to train landowners or volunteers as part of the project?  |
|                 | #3       | Too much money for one course – budget needs to explain what dollars are going to be spent on in each category.   |
|                 | #4       | Grant award to reduce registration fees – will happen regardless if funded or NOT.  |
|                 | #5       | Funds to sponsor short course, workshop.  |
|                 | #6       | Show measureable outcomes.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-PA-120     | #1       | I liked the priority setting filters (criteria for site selection) and the tie-in work of the WPC. [Have] experience leveraging past funds and describes a continuation/enhancement of ongoing work. Proposal builds permanent, long-term invasive species monitoring/control capacity. |
|                 | #2       | Well written. Good explanation of how funds would be used.  |
|                 | #3       | Show how much of the project is suppression, restoration, and education work.   |
|                 | #4       | Almost entirely focused on State lands – State parks and forests, with a bit of citizen scientist training. Equipment purchase < \$5K.  |
|                 | #5       | Contracts to control invasives.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-NJ-128     | #1       | Nice proposal. I liked the fact that the groundwork has already been laid and this finding would expand the effort. Also liked the fact that work will continue after this grant is complete.   |
|                 | #2       | Good use of outreach and partners.  |
|                 | #3       | Mention invasive species that is the focus of the project. Concern – paying consultant foresters for data they may have already collected as part of management services to landowners.   |
|                 | #4       | Need a better breakdown of the budget and how dollars are going to be spent.  |
|                 | #5       | Multifaceted. Good deliverables. Private landowner focus.   |
|                 | #6       | Strike team approach [for] Early Detection and Rapid Response. New Jersey Highlands. Relies on outreach success.  |
|                 | #7       | Good collaboration/leverage. Expected outcomes well described.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-IL-134     | #1       | Addresses multiple species, which was defined as a Redesign category proposal, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent for proposal submittal. Inventory focus with multiple applications (insects, weed management, prescription burning – stewardship plans). |
|                 | #2       | Building on a previous project, but not sure if it was a success and should be continued. Not signed by State Forester. Lots of letters of support. Sharing resources.   |
|                 | #3       | Use of Federal funds for treatments requires post-treatment evaluations. It appears this will take place but it was not specifically addressed. Very good use of a cooperative approach and use of existing programs.  |
|                 | #4       | More information on Strike Team design needed.   |
|                 | #5       | Strike team approach for exotics control/monitoring. Good collaboration, IDNR involvement.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-IL-140     | #1       | Addresses multiple species, which was defined as a Redesign category proposal, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent out for proposal submittal, even though it was aimed at restoring oak dominance as the goal (stewardship focus).                         |
|                 | #2       | Define and provide a list of acronyms. Letters of support very helpful to give context for the proposal with specific successes of earlier work.   |
|                 | #3       | Indirect costs should only be for grant salaries. Grant should not be used for housing expenses.   |
|                 | #4       | Use of Federal funds for treatments requires post-treatment evaluations. It appears this will take place but it was not specifically addressed. Very good use of a cooperative approach and use of existing programs.  |
|                 | #5       | More information on leadership of effort needed.   |
|                 | #6       | Good collaboration and strike team approach at the landscape scale. Public and agency support.   |
|                 | #7       | Weak outcomes. Redundant with the Illinois exotic proposal.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-IL-144     | #1       | Started out as Japanese chaff flower, but obviously targeted multiple weed species. Multiple species issues are defined as a Redesign category proposal, not the Forest Health category as stated in the letter sent out for proposal submittal.                                       |
|                 | #2       | Has this plant, Japanese chaff flower, been declared invasive by some entity? This project seems more like a research project.   |
|                 | #3       | This appears to be a Methods Development project, though it does appear to "fit" under Objective #3 (D) and (E). Very good grant for determining the best control methods, but should be in Methods Development or maybe Redesign. Methods not proven yet, but is a much needed study. |
|                 | #4       | "Indirect" as match is too high. Value for money.  |
|                 | #5       | Focus on one species in 11 counties. Early Detection Rapid Response candidate project. High cost.  |
|                 | #6       | Weak outcomes. Very small acres for cost.  |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-IL-147     | #1       | Multiple species involved although the goal is oak regeneration (stewardship focus?). Multiple species was defined as a Redesign category proposal in the letter sent out for proposal submittal.  |
|                 | #2       | Many letters of support. Proposal over the 5MB limit. Very high cost/benefit ratio (small area saved for high cost).   |
|                 | #3       | Forest Health grant money should not be used for contractual tree removal.   |
|                 | #4       | This proposal is better suited for Category 1 Redesign as there are more activities than just invasive plants. Tree removals cannot be done using Federal funds if the trees are dead or have commercial value. Post-treatment evaluations are required when using Federal funds.      |
|                 | #5       | "Indirect" as match is high. Value for money.  |
|                 | #6       | Restore 140 acres in 3 areas of oak savannah. Remove exotics, selective harvest. \$2,500/acre is costly.   |
|                 | #7       | Very expensive for area. High indirect.  |
|                 | #8       | Cannot fund tree planting and thinning.  |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| FY12-MI-151     | #1       | Addresses multiple species, which was defined as a Redesign category proposal, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent out for proposal submittal - even though it is aimed at invasive weeds. Primarily stewardship focused as title states. |
|                 | #2       | Useful support letters.  |
|                 | #3       | Need more clarification on the budget: who is going to be spending the money and what is the justification for what they are asking for? Fringe budget figures are outrageous.   |
|                 | #4       | Use of Federal funds for treatments requires post-treatment monitoring and evaluation of the treatment activities. This is mentioned briefly but not fully addressed in the proposal. Good use of current programs to target areas for treatment.    |
|                 | #5       | General description hard to evaluate. NRCS-EQIP role?  |
|                 | #6       | Strong stewardship plan connection. Good B:C ratio. Partner support.   |
|                 | #7       | Does not fit Forest Health authority.  |
|                 | #8       | Landowner cost share – OK. Stewardship Plans – not OK.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments   |
| FY12-WV-153     | #1       | The proposal statement is somewhat tentative in its goals "to begin outreach related to invasive species and to investigate the potential for forming a CWPMA." Scale/scope is small but funding request level is appropriate to scale.              |
|                 | #2       | Has mining ceased in this area? Wasn't clear in the proposal. Great list of partners.  |
|                 | #3       | Improve measurables such as acres to treat, number of education events, and number of people trained.  |
|                 | #4       | Purchase of seedlings with SPCH funds?? Probably would have been better submitted under Redesign with a UCF tie. Purchasing skid/excavator??   |
|                 | #5       | Goals and objectives vague beyond education efforts. Good collaboration.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number   | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-------------------|----------|---|
| FY12-IA-008       | #1       | No DUNS/EIN. Thousand cankers disease proposal. Nicely done.  |
|                   | #2       | No support letters. Budget not complete (missing benefits under personnel).   |
|                   | #3       | Budget page does not spell out how money will be spent. Most of the work is already being done by forest health staff.  |
|                   | #4       | Proposal addresses a serious threat of a major pest to Iowa's forests (walnut). Surveys are needed to target high-priority areas. 2-year proposal is needed. Personnel costs on the Federal side of the budget: for temporary staff or full-time staff? |
|                   | #5       | Expensive.  |
|                   | #6       | Well written. Survey and public awareness efforts.  |
|                   | #7       | Well supported. Good description of outcomes.   |
| Proposal Number   | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-Multi-NY-034 | #1       | Well written with sufficient detail tied to each State's efforts. Uses new technology to expand on existing survey already completed.   |
|                   | #2       | Good project. Letters of support. Reasonable budget. Multistate.  |
|                   | #3       | Need measureable outcomes – # traps to set, # of sites. Why can't this be done with base forest health program funds?   |
|                   | #4       | Good project.   |
|                   | #5       | Not broadly tested. New trapping technology, augmenting already occurring ground survey. VERY reasonable cost.  |
| Proposal Number   | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-PA-121       | #1       | Uses new technology and is a high priority/emerging issue for an infested State. Like that it builds and focuses education and outreach on partners that can/will also be looking for this pest as they conduct their routine work.                     |
|                   | #2       | Well-written proposal. Clear objectives listing personnel linked to objectives. Multiagency partnering very strong with clear roles.  |
|                   | #3       | Assume 100 traps is due to limits on amount of lure.  |
|                   | #4       | Multiagency – looks like might be separate grants if funded. HUGE disparity in the amount being requested by Pennsylvania with 32 counties and that requested in the multistate proposal (Multi-NY 034). Little more diverse, but not THAT much.        |
|                   | #5       | High-cost intensive survey and education program.   |

## FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Forest Health

| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
|-----------------|----------|---|
| FY12-WI-161     | #1       | Excellent proposal.   |
|                 | #2       | Reasonable cost for the work proposed.  |
|                 | #3       | Excellent proposal that addressed every single bullet point on the criteria listed in the RFP for Category 3 Forest Health proposals. Very cost effective; only \$18,000 per year for 2 years. Personnel costs on Federal budget: for hiring temporary staff? Or for full-time staff?                             |
|                 | #4       | Modest proposal and reasonable cost. 2 years.   |
| Proposal Number | Reviewer | Comments  |
| FY12-IN-174     | #1       | Really liked the proposal (definitely targeted forest health issues), but it addressed multiple species, which was defined as a Redesign category proposal, not Forest Health as stated in the letter sent out requesting proposal submittals.  |
|                 | #2       | Two totally different pests; seems that ALB was added as an afterthought. ALB affects other hosts, not just maple.  |
|                 | #3       | Budget does not explain what money will be used for, hiring additional employees or adding additional funds to the State forest health budget.  |
|                 | #4       | Includes two species, TCD and ALB. The Category 3 Forest Health proposals were to address single species, not two. Personnel costs in Federal budget: for temporary staff or full-time staff? Need to separate proposal into TCD and ALB proposals. Would have scored 105 points if just for TCD or just for ALB. |
|                 | #5       | TCD and ALB both in Forest Health RFP and this proposal.  |
|                 | #6       | TCD and ALB surveys proposed. 1 year only.  |
|                 | #7       | Miscategorized – should have been a Redesign submission.  |