

EMC-2025-001: Individual EMC Member Rating Results by Full Project Proposal (2025/26)

Project ID	Response #	Do you have a Conflict of Interest?	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	
EMC-2025-001	1	No	3	8	5	3	EMC-2025-001: Overall Project Rating (Sum of Avg Ratings)
EMC-2025-001	2	No	5	8	4	3	
EMC-2025-001	3	No	3	4	4	3	
EMC-2025-001	4	No	3	2	3	2	
EMC-2025-001	5	No	2	5	3	1	
EMC-2025-001	6	No	4	6	3	1	
EMC-2025-001	7	No	5	6	4	3	
EMC-2025-001	8	No	3	8	5	3	
EMC-2025-001	9	No	2	6	3	3	
EMC-2025-001	10	No	2	4	4	1	
EMC-2025-001	11	No	4	6	4	1	
EMC-2025-001	12	No	2	6	4	2	
EMC-2025-001	13	No	1	4	3	3	
EMC-2025-001	14	No	3	4	4	3	

EMC-2025-001		None	3.0	5.5	3.8	2.3	14.6
---------------------	--	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------------

Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-001	Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-001	1	Although not explicitly stated in proposal, the project would seem to address critical questions related to sedimentation, specifically use of logging roads. The project could potentially address the debate regarding opening size, fragmentation, and adjacency. The project has high feasibility, although limited collaboration.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-001	2	No direct collaboration, but appears feasible.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-001	3	While relevant, this project is less aligned with EMC's top 2025–26 priorities. It may be more appropriate for future cycles or if revised to focus more directly on sediment delivery or wildfire risk. The modeling is solid but not novel.	Fund with Revised Amounts	43900 , about 17% reduction
EMC-2025-001	4		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-001	5	I think the link between adjacency and sedimentation from the road system is weak and it was not clear how this link would be explored in depth. I do feel there is value in study adjacency requirements, but this may not be the venue.	Do Not Fund	

Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-001	Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-001	6		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-001	7	Critical Monitoring Questions weren't explicit, but seems to hit 2a and 3a. Feasibility seems strong, though unclear if/how data will be acquired from private entities.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-001	8	Deliverables 1 and 2 appear to be identical. Also, on pg4 it is stated that openings from 20-120 acres will be studied, but on pg 5 it says 20-60 acres. This could be related to the duplication of language in deliverables 1 and 2. Perhaps #2 was meant to say something else.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-001	9		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-001	10		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-001	11	This project is hyper-focused on open roads as a proxy for sediment loads. It should consider the broader context of ecological and fire impacts. It also needs to explore a stronger quantitative connection between open roads and sediment loads.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-001	12	low cost appreciated but this topic is not recognized as a priority	Fund with Revised Amounts	I chose this because it is the only undecided option
EMC-2025-001	13	If the PI could revise the proposal and include more detail about the purpose, methods, analysis, and presentation of results, it might be a viable modeling project and might be worth funding.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-001	14	I appreciated the efficiency of the funding level requested however the subject matter does not address highly ranked Critical Monitoring Questions, presents a lower level of Collaboration & Feasibility and addresses a question with lower scientific uncertainty than other proposals under consideration. The project does have a high Geographic Application score. On the whole, this project scored lower, in my efforts, than the other proposals under consideration.	Do Not Fund	

EMC-2025-003: Individual EMC Member Rating Results by Full Project Proposal (2025/26)

Project ID	Response #	Do you have a Conflict of Interest?	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	
EMC-2025-003	1	No	4	6	2	5	EMC-2025-003: Overall Project Rating (Sum of Avg Ratings)
EMC-2025-003	2	No	5	10	4	4	
EMC-2025-003	3	No	5	8	4	5	
EMC-2025-003	4	No	3	6	2	4	
EMC-2025-003	5	No	2	4	1	3	
EMC-2025-003	6	No	3	6	5	5	
EMC-2025-003	7	No	1	2	3	3	
EMC-2025-003	8	No	3	6	2	3	
EMC-2025-003	9	No	4	4	3	5	
EMC-2025-003	10	No	4	8	4	5	
EMC-2025-003	11	No	2	8	2	4	
EMC-2025-003	12	No	3	7	4	4	
EMC-2025-003	13	No	4	6	3	4	

EMC-2025-003		1 removed	3.3	6.2	3.0	4.2	16.7
---------------------	--	-----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------------

Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-003	Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-003	1	This project could potentially address several critical questions related to wildlife habitat (e.g., snags, nest trees, granary trees). Is limited in scope, although results could be broadly applied given the subject species. Seems strong collaboration and feasibility.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-003	2		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-003	3	This project fills a clear regulatory and ecological gap. It's the first to assess whether current FPRs protect granary trees, which are critical for Acorn Woodpecker survival. The methods are strong, and the results will inform adaptive management and policy.	Fund with Revised Amounts	43900 , about 17% reduction
EMC-2025-003	4		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-003	5	I think this project is too narrow in scope and not applicable to a large landscape. Additionally, I question how the project would inform changes to the FPR's.	Do Not Fund	

Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-003	Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-003	6	Collabs are very strong. Geographic applicability also strong. Doesn't target priority Crit Mon Qs, and a little unclear how much FPRs would change regardless of findings though (acorn woodpeckers aren't a listed species).	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-003	7	It seems that studies have already shown that Granary trees are important. If they are not being protected because they are not called out in the FPRs for preservation, then propose an update at the call for regulatory review.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-003	8		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-003	9		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-003	10	This is a strong proposal that addresses several CMQs, although none of the prioritized CMQs. My two main concerns are: - How much of a priority does the EMC give to understanding this research topic? - The proposal needed more specificity in its methods. Especially around the management units' enhanced protocols.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-003	11		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-003	12	Interesting research project, some questions about feasibility, but clarity from PI could increase my support for funding the project.	Fund with Revised Amounts	I chose this because it is the only undecided option
EMC-2025-003	13	The subject matter of this proposal is important to me and scores well relative to Critical Monitoring Questions and Scientific Uncertainty, however Geographic Application and Feasibility are somewhat concerning, although Collaboration is well-indicated. I am very concerned about the cost relative to other proposals and the funding available over the next 3 years.	Do Not Fund	

EMC-2025-004: Individual EMC Member Rating Results by Full Project Proposal (2025/26)

Project ID	Response #	Do you have a Conflict of Interest?	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	
EMC-2025-004	1	No	4	6	4	4	EMC-2025-004: Overall Project Rating (Sum of Avg Ratings)
EMC-2025-004	2	No	5	8	5	3	
EMC-2025-004	3	No	5	6	5	5	
EMC-2025-004	4	No	3	4	4	2	
EMC-2025-004	5	No	3	4	3	2	
EMC-2025-004	6	No	4	4	2	1	
EMC-2025-004	7	No	5	6	4	2	
EMC-2025-004	8	No	4	6	2	3	
EMC-2025-004	9	No	3	6	3	3	
EMC-2025-004	10	No	3	3	2	3	
EMC-2025-004	11	No	4	6	3	1	
EMC-2025-004	12	No	4	6	3	1	
EMC-2025-004	13	No	4	6	3	1	
EMC-2025-004	14	No	4	6	3	1	
EMC-2025-004		None	3.9	5.5	3.3	2.3	15.0
Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-004				Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-004	1	Although the project could potentially address several critical questions and scientific uncertainty regarding fuels, etc., I am concerned about the modeling and remote sensing approach, in addition to the high cost.				Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	2	Collaboration is robust. Relies on many different data sets that may not be available or of appropriate resolution to address questions, e.g. post treatment lidar (availability), and Sentinel imagery (resolution).				Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	3	This project offers practical tools and fills a gap in evaluating §1051 treatment effectiveness. It's highly aligned with EMC priorities and will produce decision-support tools that are directly useful to landowners and planners.				Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-004	4					Do Not Fund	

Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-004	Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-004	5	It is a question that needs to be answered but using Modified THPs for a data set will be challenging. There are significant amounts of fuel reduction work being completed using different regulatory pathways that should also be evaluated. The lack of ground truthing is of concern.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	6		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	7	Extremely relevant to CMQs, strong geographic application (if existing modified THP projects were available state-wide). However, some major concerns about feasibility, in terms of available projects needed to validate model and derive scenarios for decision support tool.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-004	8	This seems like it would benefit from a ground truthing component.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	9		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	10		Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	11	The focus only on assessing the outcomes of modified THPs limits the impact of this project. Instead the project could be looking at the comparability of QUIC-Fire with other fuels reduction modeling efforts and focusing on creating very useful products for specific user groups.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	12	proposal	Fund with Revised Amounts	this answer provides uncertainty desired
EMC-2025-004	13	Interesting modeling exercise, serious concerns about scope and feasibility.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-004	14	The Critical Monitoring Question for this proposal is very highly ranked, but concerns regarding Scientific Uncertainty, Geographic Application, and Feasibility present some concern, although it scores well on Collaboration. The magnitude of this proposal's funding request is concerning, relative to the EMC's ability to fund other worthwhile studies.	Do Not Fund	

EMC-2025-005: Individual EMC Member Rating Results by Full Project Proposal (2025/26)

Project ID	Response #	Do you have a Conflict of Interest?	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	
EMC-2025-005	1	No	3	5	4	3	EMC-2025-005: Overall Project Rating (Sum of Avg Ratings)
EMC-2025-005	2	No	5	6	4	3	
EMC-2025-005	3	No	5	6	4	5	
EMC-2025-005	4	No	4	6	3	4	
EMC-2025-005	5	No	5	6	4	5	
EMC-2025-005	6	No	5	8	3	5	
EMC-2025-005	7	No	4	8	5	4	
EMC-2025-005	8	No	4	8	4	4	
EMC-2025-005	9	No	4	3	3	5	
EMC-2025-005	10	No	4	7	4	4	
EMC-2025-005	11	No	4	8	3	3	
EMC-2025-005	12	No	5	8	4	5	
EMC-2025-005	13	No	5	8	4	5	

EMC-2025-005		1 removed	4.4	6.7	3.8	4.2	19.1
---------------------	--	-----------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-------------

Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-005	Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-005	1	The project could potentially dovetail with other currently funded projects to further address critical questions and scientific uncertainty, although much work and funding has already gone to this topic. Concerned about modeling and remote sensing aspects of project, as well as some of the collaborators inability to deliver results on previously funded project.	Do Not Fund	
EMC-2025-005	2		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	3	This is a timely and relevant project that evaluates post-fire forest management strategies. It supports adaptive planning and wildfire resilience, and the team has access to excellent data and field sites.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	4		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	5		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	6	Excellent applicability to Critical Monitoring Questions and high Scientific Uncertainty. Feasibility and Collaborations are strong, particularly with inclusion of field validation.	Fund As Requested	

Project ID	Response #	Comments on EMC-2025-005	Initial Funding Recommendation (this does not constitute a vote)	If you Answered "Fund with Revised Amounts", what Dollar Amount in Total (all years) would you like to see funded?
EMC-2025-005	7		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	8		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	9		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	10	This is a strong project that is tackling some large questions with a relatively small budget.	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	11	prior concerns about contractor may not be attributable to the contractor but the local PI and the impacts of Dixie Fire	Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	12		Fund As Requested	
EMC-2025-005	13	The only 'weak' spot in this proposal, in my opinion, relates to the use of a single forest, although well-documented, as a reference site. Adding other well-documented forests as additional reference sites would strengthen this proposal.	Fund As Requested	