



## Western Forestry Leadership Coalition FY2010 Western Competitive Resource Allocation Frequently Asked Questions

### National Guidance

#### **Q1: Do States have to work with the US Forest Service Regional Office to craft their competitive proposal?**

A: The FY2010 National Guidance reads – “USFS Regions/Area and States shall work together when identifying and evaluating possible Competitive Resource Allocation proposals.” This is not meant to require regional review of projects, but to more strongly encourage collaboration. This collaboration will help States stay informed of all technical and financial resources available for their projects. It will also encourage early consideration of the mix of funding necessary for successful completion of projects.

#### **Q2: Has changing the wording of the National Theme "Enhance Public Benefits Associated with Trees and Forests" to "Enhance Public Benefits from Private Forests" changed its intent?**

A: No, the wording of the National Theme was changed in the National Guidance to reflect language used in the 2008 Farm Bill and does not indicate a change in intent.

### Project Proposal Evaluation and Scoring

#### **Q3: How do match, leverage, and collaboration differ? How will each item be scored during the FY2010 Western Competitive Grant Process?**

A: “Match” is the required contribution from the state and other non-federal partners equal to the amount of the grant requested. Measured in dollars and described in a narrative, “leverage” is the project-specific value of contributions by the applicant and project partners toward mutual outcomes. “Collaboration” is the demonstrated engagement of partners in project development and implementation. Match is required for project eligibility, but is not scored. Leverage and collaboration are evaluation criteria and will be scored. More details can be found on the FAQ specifically on *Match, Leverage and Collaboration* at [www.wflcweb.org/spf\\_grants\\_10/](http://www.wflcweb.org/spf_grants_10/).

#### **Q4: What is meant by “sphere of influence” in the application?**

A: A project may have a larger “sphere of influence” than its physical footprint, its duration, and the people involved. A project that adds value beyond state boundaries is one that can be used as an example and replicated in other areas and by other groups has a large sphere of influence. Replication may happen concurrently with project implementation, but more likely will happen in the future once others have the opportunity to learn from the success of the project.

#### **Q5: What is meant by “meaningful scale”?**

A: Bigger is not always better. A project scale that is “meaningful” is linked to the project objectives and is the appropriate scale at which to accomplish those objectives. For example, if the objective is to reduce sedimentation *in a watershed* through improved forest management, then the project scale should be *the whole watershed*, not a portion of it, and need not include lands outside of the watershed. However, in the face of funding constraints, a meaningful project may be proposed on a portion of the watershed as part of a multi-year phased approach to achieving outcomes throughout the entire watershed.

**Western Forestry Leadership Coalition  
FY2010 Western Competitive Resource Allocation  
Frequently Asked Questions**

**Q6: Will linking a project proposal to a priority area identified in a state wide assessment be scored?**

A: No. However, states are encouraged to begin working that information into project proposals to the extent that it is helpful in clearly defining the appropriate geographic scale of the project, scope and goals, objectives and output measures, outcomes, and how grant funds are to be used.

**Western Competitive Grant Team**

**Q7: How are members of the review team appointed and selected?**

A: Members of the review team are selected to maintain a balance of state (1/2) and federal (1/2) representatives, as well as disciplinary and programmatic diversity. In the past, the WFLC committees were responsible for nominating members. Without committees, the process will need to be evaluated.

**Q8: Will members of the review team undergo training to improve consistency of reviews from one reviewer to the next?**

A: Yes! Given the diversity of the grant team, scores will never be totally consistent, but the team will be undergoing a series of “calibration” scoring exercises to improve consistency in interpretation of the evaluation criteria.

**Suggestions and questions can be directed to [dcoelho@fs.fed.us](mailto:dcoelho@fs.fed.us), 303.445.4364.**