

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-002	#1	Fuel reduction on State Forest. What is the end result or expected outcome of the field days? Is there a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) for adjacent communities?
	#2	"Scope of work" lists Shimek State Forest, not Stephens. Need to show a better tie to hazard mitigation with links to CWPPs and/or communities at risk. Are any partners/collaboration involved in this project? Previously submitted proposal.
	#3	Grant was cut and pasted from Shimek State Forest grant application and still has references to the Shimek State Forest. Is this truly hazard mitigation or forest management? No partners or Federal stakeholders identified. Should incorporate a CWPP.
	#4	Need for collaboration; bring in fire departments and nongovernmental organizations.
	#5	Scope of work refers to Shimek State Forest, not Stephens State Forest. No mention of prescribed fire to be used. What is the level of wildland-urban interface? Is the area covered by a CWPP? Who are the partners? Good tie-in to the State Forest Action Plan.
	#6	Not innovative. Good value for the money.
	#7	Weak on community involvement.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IA-003	#1	Carbon copy of the Stephens State Forest Proposal. More editing would make for a better proposal. No mention of completed Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs) in Farmington. A completed CWPP would make both of Iowa's State Forest proposals much stronger.
	#2	Need to show a better tie to hazard mitigation with links to CWPPs and/or communities at risk. Are any partners/collaboration involved in this project? Previously submitted proposal.
	#3	Is this truly hazard mitigation or forest management? No partners or Federal stakeholders identified. Should incorporate a CWPP.
	#4	Need for collaboration; bring in fire departments and nongovernmental organizations.
	#5	Good tie-in to the State Forest Action Plan. Basically same grant as above [FY12-IA-002], so same comments apply.
	#6	Basal area reduction. Use of silviculture. Commercial option?
	#7	Weak on community involvement.
	#8	What is current basal area? What is desired basal area?

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-IL-139	#1	Not signed by the State Forester. Basing funds to mitigate fuels on a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) that is not yet complete. Very expensive project... Average \$3,907 to mitigate 1 acre of fuels. Putting in place an Incident Command System (ICS) with locals for emergency response might be considered capacity building and perhaps disallowable under the RFP. This proposal is well outside of what could be considered reasonable. By their own calculations they are asking for \$1,172,130 to mitigate fuels on 300 acres or \$3,907.10 per acre.
	#2	This proposal will far exceed the 15 percent cap of available funds. No budget detail given in the narrative or budget tables other than contractual – how would these funds actually be spent? Identified project objectives are not consistent with the amount of funding requested. Objective 3, Put in place ICS with locals for emergency response: is this "suppression capacity building" that does not qualify under grant guidelines? Question on match as also listed as contractual in the budget table?
	#3	The funding level seems extremely high for outcomes described. I thought originally it was a typo. Also, includes prescribed fire training courses, which seem to be outside the scope of the grant.
	#4	Very expensive proposal; not clear what costs so much. Good tie-in to CWPP. Could use more detail on wildland-urban interface risk, e.g. fire occurrence, structures damaged, fuel types, etc.
	#5	Value for the money not clear.
	#6	3-year implementation of CWPP, previous grant. High cost.
	#7	Expensive for outcomes indicated.

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-MA-100	#1	Is equipment for wildfire? If so, is this capacity building? Not sure if indirect costs should be part of subgrantees as well as the State. Purchase of fire suppression equipment. There is the suggestion on page 2 that previous hazardous mitigation funding has been used to complete “more than 25 wildland fire training courses.” “Conservancy Fire Management staff work closely with local, State, and Federal agencies to conduct wildland fire training...” Budget requests personal protective equipment, tools, hardware, hoses, standard firefighting gear, etc. Might be considered capacity building and perhaps disallowable under the RFP. Can a “subgrantee (TNC)” and the State charge an indirect fee? Total indirect being requested by both is \$69,998.02 or roughly 20 percent of total funds requested.
	#2	The proposal did not follow the RFP guidelines and the funding category is not listed. No timetable is listed in the narrative. Identified fuels treatments should be better tied to communities at risk.
	#3	Personnel costs are exceeded if the subgrantees’ personnel costs are included. Training courses seem to be outside the scope of the grant.
	#4	Good explanation of budget, but the math is incorrect. Good tie-in to Community Wildfire Protection Plan. Nice explanation of fire risk/hazard.
	#5	Much funding (\$350K), not many specifics – where, why, when, etc. No term of grant that I could discern.
	#6	Anecdotal examples of priorities. Need landscape analysis.

*FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation*

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-MD-204</b>	#1	Clear, concise proposal with good partnerships. Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs), fuel reduction, and public education.
	#2	Methods Development Proposal – Not Rated.
	#3	Personnel costs are exceeded if the subgrantees'/contractors' personnel costs are included.
	#4	Name some of the expected cooperators.
	#5	Excellent timeline detail. On the performance measurement matrix it says "MAP" under # of CARs, but no map is with the application.
	#6	Builds from the wildland-urban interface assessment of 2005 – 12 CWPPs in high-risk communities. This is fine; nothing spectacular, though.
	#7	Firewise educational programs, development of CWPPs in 12+ communities.
	#8	Over \$300,000.
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-ME-108</b>	#1	Good proposal with clearly identified goals and objectives tied to Community Wildfire Protection Plans and communities at risk.
	#2	Good description of partners; good use of college interns with wildfire concentration. Innovative outreach to lake associations (Lake Smart, Firewise).
	#3	Not clear whether mechanical chipping or prescribed burn. Firewise USA is good.
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-MI-009</b>	#1	Personnel costs are exceeded if the subgrantees' personnel costs are included. No education/outreach. Need Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP)/Firewise linkage.
	#2	Include some collaboration with outside groups.
	#3	Not much detail (fire history, wildland-urban interface, fuel types, CWPPs, etc.?). Not much mentioned about partnerships.
	#4	Does not tie ground work to criteria.
	#5	Forty-five prescribed fires on 2,500 acres of State land.
	#6	Need to demonstrate partnerships and outcomes. Not specific as to actions. No outcomes.

*FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation*

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-MN-077</b>	#1	Math is wrong in the budget table (table 1, line 6 and total). Innovative approach with Firewise in the classroom. Well-rounded application overall.
	#2	Community Wildfire Protection Plans integrated with stewardship planning. Good measurables.
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-MN-085</b>	#1	Question completion date of 4/2012. Is this project already funded by the State? Mitigation for storm damage. Not sure what a streamlined approach to Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) development is. Not sure how communities will contribute.
	#2	Innovative approach involving partners to deal with a significant weather event adding to fuel accumulations in communities at risk.
	#3	Link to Wisconsin proposal for blowdown area.
	#4	Math is wrong in table 1 (Federal share doesn't add up to \$250,000). Significant event that needs to be mitigated.
	#5	Post-tornado Community Wildfire Protection Plans. Interstate – 54 communities.
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-NJ-133</b>	#1	No State Forester signature but a very good proposal. Community Wildfire Protection Plans, targeted area, community outreach.
	#2	Capital Equipment purchases seem outside the scope of the grant.
	#3	Well-described project as well as fire issue. Could have expanded how project fits with the State Forest Action Plan; very weak.
	#4	Success measures not quantified.
	#5	Need National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System measures; need better description of outcomes.
	#6	Very weak connection to the State Forest Action Plan.

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NJ-183	#1	Maintaining aviation equipment for support of fire projects...\$75,000...sounds like capacity building. Not signed by State Forester. Funds are primarily for purchasing stuff. Maintaining aviation equipment is an activity that will likely occur without this grant. Using these funds to “maintain” aircraft could be considered supplanting? Might be considered capacity building and perhaps disallowable under the RFP.
	#2	Question on applicability of carding aircraft utilizing mitigation funds; is the capacity building under other State Fire Assistance funds? Partners not identified or engaged in projects.
	#3	Equipment purchases seem outside the scope of the grant.
	#4	Could have expanded tie-in with State Forest Action Plans more.
	#5	No equipment costs, but mentioned in proposal? No partners.
	#6	6,000 acres and 75 miles of firebreak.
	#7	Justify equipment; better suited for New Jersey fuels program.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-001	#1	Hiring trained fire fighters – capacity building? Fire training for 15 local fire fighters – also capacity building? Would Volunteer Fire Assistance be a more appropriate funding source? Hiring seasonal firefighters/training in S130/190 might be considered capacity building and perhaps disallowable under the RFP.
	#2	Is this capacity building or hazard mitigation? "Hiring of personnel for emergency response." Needs to show a tie to a developed Community Wildfire Protection Plan and communities at risk.
	#3	Training courses seem to be outside the scope of the grant. Contracting cost for mechanical treatment of 15 acres seems excessive.
	#4	This grant really borders on preparedness and suppression capacity building (two seasonal firefighters, S130 and 190, etc.), which is excluded from funding. Could have expanded tie-in with State Forest Action Plan. Could have expanded on partners.
	#5	Recurring – building on success. Multifaceted.

Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-NY-071	#1	No stated tie to strategic priorities in the State's Forest Action Plan really hurt this proposal. Two separate Web sites are in use...dec.ny.gov?public is functional... newyorkfirewise.org does not currently have functional links. Which one does the State intend to use?
	#2	The title of the proposal is "Community Wildfire Protection Plan Promotion & Development" but the number of Community Wildfire Protection Plans is not identified or outlined in the proposal. Also need to indicate the number of acres to be treated for mitigation.
	#3	No linkage to the State [Forest Action] Plan or Northeastern Area plans. Purchase of simulation table (equipment) seems to be outside the scope of the grant.
	#4	No reference to State Forest Action Plan. Good use of technology with simulator.
	#5	Weak; does not tie to the State Forest Action Plan or Northeastern Area Strategic Plan. Equipment purchase – Simtable at \$26K – is nearly ½ the requested amount.
	#6	OK but didn't clearly address criteria.
	#7	Lacks collaboration/partnership. Outcomes need to be better described to the need.
	#8	No abstract. Wrong template. No partnerships.
Proposal Number	Reviewer	Comments
FY12-OH-098	#1	Firewise recognition, tie to Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs), local partnerships...very strong proposal.
	#2	Good proposal, but need to list some specific objectives....number of CWPPs, number of acres treated, number of outreach programs, etc.
	#3	Excellent detail in scope of work. Clearly described what will be done, how, and why. Talked about fuels, past fires, partners, etc. Very good!
	#4	Difficult to pull out objectives, scope of work, and quantified results expected. Working with Northern Research Station on fire behavior.
	#5	Describe outcomes better. No National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System measures.

*FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation*

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-PA-119</b>	#1	Very similar to previous application. Focused on prevention, funds for training wardens, and volunteer companies (capacity building?). Database development? Question \$30,000 for travel, all within State. By my calculations, that's more than 54,000 miles, enough money to drive across Pennsylvania 176 times! There is nothing in the grant narrative that supports this amount of travel.
	#2	More direct linkage to the Allegheny National Forest Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) would strengthen the proposal.
	#3	Need to tie the project to your State Forest Action Plan.
	#4	Maintaining a volunteer warden program will be important as budgets shrink.
	#5	Banking on \$100K in-kind from volunteer hours. Otherwise, good project.
	#6	Firewise and CWPP – Fire wardens and the Allegheny National Forest involved.
	#7	Not terribly innovative.
<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-WI-166</b>	#1	Good link between projects and CWPPs – focus on defensible space.
	#2	Question on other cost identified – "land improvements."
	#3	Comprehensive program. Good tie-in to the State Forest Action Plan and communities at risk map. Maybe a little discussion on fire problem (recent fire activity, structures lost/threatened, fuel types, etc.).
	#4	Needs more detail on performance measures and any innovation.
	#5	Aggressive community involvement.
	#6	Needs National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System measures; otherwise, good proposal.

*FY2012 CARP Reviewer Comments: Hazard Mitigation*

---

<b>Proposal Number</b>	<b>Reviewer</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>FY12-WI-168</b>	#1	Two separate grants (WI, MN) working to address hazard from blowdown. Ambitious program with education and outreach.
	#2	Is this tied to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan? Identify number of acres to be treated. Question on other cost identified – "land improvements."
	#3	Clearly described a significant fire issue. Attached supporting photos were great.
	#4	No National Fire Plan Operations and Reporting System measures. Outcomes not well described. Isolated location. Already funded.