# **USDA** Forest Service

Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program Advisory Committee Meeting

Denver, CO

**April 4-6, 2023** 

# CONTENTS

Meeting Summary Day 1 (April 4, 2023)	1
Meeting Opening	1
Agenda, Meeting Norms & process overview	1
Proposal Review	2
Closing Remarks	3
Meeting Summary Day 2 (April 5, 2023)	4
Opening Remarks	4
Review of Remaining Proposals (continued)	4
Public Comment	5
Proposal Review Continued	5
Closing Remarks	5
Meeting Summary Day 3 (April 6, 2023)	6
Opening Remarks	6
Proposal overview discussion	6
Funding recommendations	6
Reflections/Closing Remarks	7
Attachment A: CFLRP MEETING AGENDA, April 4-April 6, 2023	8
Attachment B: COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND FOREST SERVICE STAFF	10

# MEETING SUMMARY DAY 1 (APRIL 4, 2023)

#### MEETING OPENING

The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR) Advisory Committee is chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and is tasked with reviewing, evaluating, and providing recommendations on each nominated Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) project to the Secretary of Agriculture for final selections. It is solely advisory in nature. The advisory committee is chartered for two years and may meet as often as is necessary to review and evaluate CFLRP proposals and make recommendations.

On April 4, 2023, Charles Oliver, the CFLR Advisory Committee Designated Federal Official (DFO), convened a meeting of the CFLR Advisory Committee at 9:12am MST at the Cesar Chavez Memorial Building in Denver, CO. Nine out of twelve Committee members were present on day one of the meeting. Laurene Hamilton and Jonathan Bakker were absent due to prior engagements. They planned to attend virtually on day three of the meeting. Kathleen McIntyre was absent due to illness. (See Attachment B for a list of attendees.) Daily notes and meeting summaries were provided to Committee members who were not present.

Mr. Oliver thanked the Committee for their participation and summarized the goals and objectives of the meeting. He reminded the Committee that their primary objective was to jointly evaluate and judge the merits of the four CFLRP proposals using the selection criteria as a guide. Mr. Oliver stated that, at the end of the three days, the Committee was expected to determine which new projects to recommend to the USDA Secretary for funding. Specifically, the committee will:

• Provide a ranking of recommended projects to fund, as funding becomes available. Up to ten and no more than 2 new projects per region can be funded per year, per the legislation.

#### AGENDA, MEETING NORMS & PROCESS OVERVIEW

As part of the Opening Remarks, the facilitator gave an overview of the process for the three-day meeting, during which the Committee would discuss the strengths and weaknesses of four proposals and seek consensus on which of them to recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture for funding. He then asked that everyone go around the room and introduce themselves, including what brought them to the room for this meeting.

Bryce Esch and Megan Lowell then spoke on the CFLRP process, background, and the projects funded to date. Bryce Esch went on to talk about CFLRP Lessons Learned. She spoke on the past 10 years of CFLRP, the results of these lessons learned, and best practices that have been put into place. Ms. Esch wrapped up this section by talking to the group about the ongoing challenges the projects must continue to work through.

The Facilitation Team continued the discussion by going over the Scoring Results Dashboard. The dashboard consists of the Committee member's evaluation high/medium/low scores, submitted in

04/04/2023-04/06/2023

advance of today's session. The facilitator noted the Ouachitia Mountains had the most consensus in scores and was highest scored proposal. He then presented the Proposal Review Dashboard, and more specifically each proposal as listed on the dashboard.

#### **NOTE ON RECUSALS:**

Committee members must recuse themselves by not scoring the relevant proposal(s), not actively participating in the detailed discussion of that proposal(s), and will notify the Designated Federal Official in the following situations:

- The committee member, or any member of their immediate family or organization employing them, would directly or indirectly financially benefit from a CFLRP proposal being evaluated
- The committee member had an identified role in planning, implementation and/or monitoring of the project
- The committee member, due to some other involvement or relationship, feels they would be incapable of being objective in evaluating the proposal.

There were no Committee Members who needed to recuse themselves from any of the four proposals.

#### PROPOSAL REVIEW

The Committee then began to review each of the four proposals. The facilitator reviewed the process that the Committee would use for the remainder of the day's agenda and the next day of proposal review. Each proposal would be reviewed for up to 1 hour and 45 minutes each in the following manner:

- Review of the highlights of the proposal
- Discussion of the evaluation ranges shown on the heat map of scoresheet results
- Discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal

The Committee then began working their way through the four proposals one-by-one, beginning with the Ouachita Mountains Forest and Community Health proposal. Highlights of the Committee's discussion were captured on a flip chart and in notes taken by the Facilitation Team so they could be reviewed again during the final deliberations for recommendations and to record any information to be provided to proposal authors as feedback.

The Committee reviewed the proposal highlights and summary evaluation ranges before beginning to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the Ouachita Mountains Forest and Community Health proposal. The day's Proposal Review schedule was as follows. All times are approximate.

- 3:20-3:30 MST: Facilitator shows the results of the scoresheets and goes over the heatmap that was created by weighing each of the committees scores
- 3:30-3:33 MST: Committee reviews the highlights of this proposal and discusses questions they had when initially reviewing the proposal
- 3:33-4:27 MST: Committee discusses the Evaluation Ranges of this proposal

• 4:27-4:45 MST: Committee discusses the Strengths and Weaknesses

The committee finished their review of the first proposal on time per the agenda for the day. They agreed on an order for review of the remaining three proposals the following day. The committee decided to wait on a consensus value until all the proposals are heard.

#### **CLOSING REMARKS**

In his closing remarks, the facilitator thanked the Committee for a successful first day of discussions. He opened the floor for any remaining logistics questions and shared the plan for the next day. Mr. Oliver thanked the committee for the discussion and conversation that was had on the first day.

## MEETING SUMMARY DAY 2 (APRIL 5, 2023)

#### **OPENING REMARKS**

The second day of the CFLR Advisory Committee discussions began at 9:00 AM MST. Committee members Jon Bakker, Kat McIntyre, and Laurene Hamilton were not able to attend. The facilitator welcomed everyone back and gave a recap of what happened the previous day. The Committee was reminded that the afternoon would include public comment. The Committee agreed that, if they were to get ahead of schedule, they would pull agenda items from the third day into the second day. They also agreed to keep the final scoring of the four proposals to the morning of the third day. The facilitator asked the Committee what order they would like to discuss the proposals and they agreed to continue moving top to bottom based on initial scoresheet responses.

#### REVIEW OF REMAINING PROPOSALS (CONTINUED)

The facilitator led the Committee through a review of the remaining 3 proposals. Using a process similar to Day One, the Committee evaluated strengths and weaknesses, discussed recommendations, and clarified any questions or key items necessary for decision making. The day's Proposal Review schedule were as follows. All times are approximate.

- 9:06-10:30am MST: Restoring Resilience to the Tahoe-Central Sierra Evaluation Review
- 10:30-10:45am MST: CFLRP Process Discussion
- 10:45-11:10am MST: Break
- 11:10-11:32am MST: Tahoe-Central Sierra Strengths and Weaknesses
- 11:32-12:05pm MST: Giant Sequoia Monument Restoration Collaborative Proposal Review
- 12:05-1:20pm MST: Lunch
- 1:20-2:20pm MST: Giant Sequoia Evaluation Review
- 2:20-2:30pm MST: Giant Sequoia Strengths and Weaknesses
- 2:30-3:00pm MST Break
- 3:00-3:12pm MST: Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Watershed and Timber Restoration Proposal Review
- 3:12-3:30pm MST: Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Evaluation Review

The Committee discussed one proposal before stopping to discuss the CFLR process. During this time the facilitator reminded the Committee that they would be scoring the proposals on the morning of Day Three. The Committee agreed to a 10-minute period to review each proposal before discussing it further. After a break, the Committee wrapped up the second proposal discussion and began reviewing the third. The Committee then stopped for lunch, after which they finished review of the third proposal and began review of the fourth. The Committee stopped review to hold the public comment period.

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

At 3:30pm MST the facilitator started the Public Comment section of the agenda. The period for public comment was open from 3:30-4:00pm MST. Comments were delivered to the committee via phone and in written format. The comment order was assigned on a first come, first served basis via email the week prior. Each commenter was given 3 minutes to make remarks and was timed by the facilitator. The scheduled commenters were:

#### Written Comment:

- Jim Parma, Bell Lumber and Pole Company: Support of the Ouachita Mountains Proposal
- John Robison, Idaho Conservation League: Support of previously approved, not yet funded, projects in Idaho. Questions on permanent roads; using non-CFLRP money to build collaborative capacity.
- Bk1492@aol.com, anonymous comment: Opposes forest management.

#### Phone Comment:

- Luke Lewis, AR Game and Fish Commission: Support of Ouachita Mountains Proposal
- Joe Fox, AR State Forestry: Support of Ouachita Mountains Proposal
- McRee Anderson, The Nature Conservancy: Support of Ouachita Mountains Proposal

Mr. Oliver concluded the Public Comment section by thanking those who contributed.

#### PROPOSAL REVIEW CONTINUED

After the Public Comment, the Committee continued their review of the fourth proposal. Review was scheduled as follows. All times are approximate.

- 3:52-4:17pm MST: Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Evaluation Review Continued
- 4:17-4:36pm MST: Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Strengths and Weaknesses

#### **CLOSING REMARKS**

At the close of proposal review, the facilitator recapped what the Committee had completed on Day Two. The Committee was asked to prepare for Day Three by coming up with strengths and weaknesses for the Ouachita Mountains Forest and Community Health proposal. They were also asked to be prepared to discuss the pre-planned topics as well as the draft letter to the Secretary.

Mr. Oliver presented the Committee with the results of the 2010, 2012, 2019, and 2021 FACA meetings. The Committee discussed these results including proposals that were approved but not yet funded. A Committee member who was not present provided feedback on a proposal for the group to consider by email. Mr. Oliver thanked the Committee for their attention and engagement and adjourned the meeting at 4:50pm MST.

## MEETING SUMMARY DAY 3 (APRIL 6, 2023)

#### **OPENING REMARKS**

The facilitator welcomed the Committee for the third day of the meeting. Committee member, Jon Bakker was able to join virtually and the facilitator asked that he introduce himself to the group. He went over the agenda for the day. The Committee was notified that Kat McIntyre would not be able to attend. Also, that Committee member, Laurene Hamilton, would be joining for the afternoon session.

#### PROPOSAL OVERVIEW DISCUSSION

At 9:51am MST, the facilitator passed out half sheet of paper to the Committee, asking them to write down the names of the four proposals and putting an "x" next to the proposal(s) they felt they would have trouble recommending move forward for funding. The group then passed their papers around the room so everyone could review each of the papers. After this exercise, the Committee talked about commonalities seen throughout the papers. The facilitator asked those Committee members who had concerns moving one or more proposals forward to speak on why they thought that way. The facilitator then asked those who had not had any issues, wanting all four proposals to move forward, to speak on their thoughts. The Committee took a break at 10:53 before continuing discussion on whether or not to recommend the proposals move forward in greater detail.

#### **FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee decided to move forward with a recommendation of two of the four proposals, The Ouachita Mountains Forest and Community Health proposal and the Giant Sequoia Monument Restoration proposal. They decided to rank these two with first, the Ouachita proposal, being the priority to move forward. The Committee had in-depth conversations about both Restoring Resilience to the Tahoe Central Sierra and Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Watershed and Timber Restoration. There were many concerns around both proposals and the Committee would like to see these projects refine their proposals and resubmit in the future. The Committee recognizes the need of funding for these projects but cannot recommend the two proposals at this time.

The following is the Final List of Funding Priorities (2023):

Sequence	Final List of Funding Priorities (2023)	
1	Ouachita Mountains Forest and Community Health	
2	Giant Sequoia Monument Restoration	

#### REFLECTIONS/CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Oliver addressed the committee, reminding them of their responsibilities over the next few weeks. The Committee agreed to work with the Committee Chair, Neil Chapman, to give feedback for the draft letter to the Secretary. The Committee agreed that the final letter would be turned in by the week of May 15, 2023. Mr. Oliver thanked the Committee for the discussion on changes they would like to see to the RFP process. He suggested that any further recommendations or thoughts be sent to Bryce Esch.

Mr. Oliver closed out the day by letting the group know that their thorough review of the new project proposals was much appreciated. He ended by reminding the Committee that their commitment is for two years and that they may be tapped in the future for their expertise. He thanked the Committee for a job well done.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:42 pm MST.

# ATTACHMENT A: CFLRP MEETING AGENDA, APRIL 4-APRIL 6, 2023

# **USDA FOREST SERVICE**

# COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, April 4 through Thursday, April 6, 2023 Denver, CO

### Objectives:

- Jointly evaluate CFLRP proposals
- Recommend which proposals should receive funding

Day 1 – Tuesday, April 4, 2023					
Start	End	Items			
8:30AM	9:00AM	Doors open before meeting start			
9:00AM	10:45AM	<ul> <li>Welcome and Opening remarks</li> <li>Introduction and Panel Engagement</li> <li>Agenda and Consensus Process review</li> </ul>			
10:45AM	11:00AM	Break			
11:00AM	12:15PM	<ul><li> CFLRP Review</li><li> CFLRP Lessons Learned</li></ul>			
12:15PM	1:45PM	Lunch—Mid-day break			
1:45PM	3:30PM	<ul> <li>2023 Proposal Review</li> <li>Review of Summary Evaluations</li> <li>Review of Ouachita Mountains Forest and Community Health Proposal</li> </ul>			
3:30PM	3:45PM	Break			
3:45PM	4:30PM	<ul> <li>Continued Review of Ouachita Mountains Forest and Community Health Proposal</li> <li>Recap of the day</li> </ul>			
4:30PM	4:45PM	Closing remarks			

Day 2 – Wednesday, April 5, 2023				
Start	End	Items		
8:30AM	9:00AM	Doors open before meeting start		
9:00AM	10:15	<ul> <li>Session Preview</li> <li>Review of Restoring Resilience to the Tahoe Central Sierra</li> </ul>		
10:15AM	10:30AM	Break		
10:30AM	12:00PM	<ul> <li>Continued review of Restoring Resilience to the Tahoe Central Sierra</li> <li>Review of Giant Sequoia Monument Restoration Proposal</li> </ul>		
12:00PM	1:15PM	Lunch-Mid-day break		
1:15PM	3:15PM	<ul> <li>Continued review of Giant Sequoia Monument Restoration Proposal</li> <li>Review of Uinta-Wasatch-Cache Watershed and Timber Restoration</li> </ul>		
3:15PM	3:30PM	Break		
3:30PM	4:30PM	Public Comment		
4:30PM	4:45PM	<ul><li>Recap of the day</li><li>Closing remarks</li></ul>		

Day 3 – Thursday, April 6, 2023				
Start	End	Items		
8:30AM	9:00AM	<ul> <li>Doors open before meeting start</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Recap of the previous days</li> </ul>		
9:00AM	10:45AM	<ul> <li>Rankings and Recommendations</li> </ul>		
		Feedback to Applicants discussion		
10:45AM	11:00AM	Break		
11:00AM	12:15AM	Topic Discussion		
12:15PM	1:45PM	Lunch-Mid-day break		
1:45PM	3:15PM	Topic Discussion		
3:15PM	3:30PM	Break		
3:30PM	4:30PM	Draft Recommendations to the Secretary		
		Recognition of the Committee		
4:30PM	4:45PM	Closing remarks		

#### ATTACHMENT B: COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND FOREST SERVICE STAFF

#### Committee Members:

- Jonathan Bakker, University of Washington School of Environmental and Forest Sciences
   Professor
- Susan Jane Brown, Western Environmental Law Center -Staff Attorney
- Pete Caligiuri, The Nature Conservancy -Forest Strategy Director
- Neil Chapman, Flagstaff Fire Department -Forest Health Supervisor
- Jim Inglis, Pheasants Forever & Quail Forever-Director of Government Affairs
- Kathleen McIntyre, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Forest Health Program Manager
- James Ford, Square O Consulting LLC-CEO
- Nolo Martinez, Mano-Y-Ola-Co-President
- Britta Dyer, American Forests-Senior Director of CA and the Pacific Islands
- Leonard Jordan, LJ Conservation Matter, LLC-Consultant
- Molly Pitts, Federal Timber Committee-Staff Executive

#### Forest Service Staff:

- Charles Oliver, CFLRP Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
- Megan Lowell, Acting Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Group Lead
- Bryce Esch, Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program Assistant Coordinator

#### Contractor Support (Facilitation Team):

- Kendall Lott, Facilitator, M Powered Strategies
- Natalie Hall, Notetaker, M Powered Strategies
- Greg Yenchi, Technology, M Powered Strategies