



April 4th, 2022
1:00pm – 4:00pm

Oregon Conservation and Recreation Fund
Adversary Committee Meeting

Agenda Item 1: Review and Approve Meeting Minutes
(March 7th, 2022)

Draft Motion Templates re: Minutes

I move to approve the March 7th, 2022 meeting minutes with the continued authority to correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation.

I move to approve the March 7th, 2022 meeting minutes with the addition/correction/ deletion of _____ on page ____, line _____, and continued authority to correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation.

Agenda Item 2: OCRF Updates and Announcements

The Nature of Oregon Day

- April 7th from now on will be known in Oregon as “The Nature of Oregon”
- This day aims to draw attention to the wonders of Oregon’s natural places – including animals and plants – and all the different ways Oregonians can enjoy what is around us.
- This day also highlights how important it is for us to protect our natural world.

Agenda Item 3: Beaver Survey and Restoration: central coast estuaries – Project Update

***Agenda Item 4: 2021 winter/2022 spring Proposal –
Scoring Presentation***

Submitted Projects

59 Projects were Submitted for the Winter 2021 / Spring 2022 round that **closed on February 24th**

Total requested funds
\$2,336,620

Total amount of funds
that will be granted this
round ~\$750,000

Submitted Projects – General Timeline

March 7th 2022	OCRF Advisory Committee discuss scoring rubric and guidelines ODFW Staff Review
April 4th 2022	OCRF Advisory Committee finalize scoring guidelines and process OCRF Committee scoring
May 2nd 2022	OCRF Advisory Committee review Final selection of projects
June 17th 2022	ODFW Commission Approval Process

ODFW Staff Review Process

- ODFW Division Administrators were provided proposals to assign staff to review to review on March 23rd.
- Divisions included: Fish (8 proposals), Wildlife (19 proposals), Habitat (19 proposals), and Information & Education (13 proposals).
- Each division has selected at least 2 staff to conduct reviews.
- Staff reviews are due back to OCRF by April 6th and will be provided to OCRF Advisory Committee members along with Proposals for their consideration while reviewing.
- ODFW staff reviews will be made public along with final decisions of the OCRF Advisory committee; however, staff names will not be included on reviews.

Staff Review Sheet

Does the proposed project address a priority need for the State of Oregon?

(This can be for State management, regulations, general social and environmental wellbeing, etc., regardless of how this work aligns specifically to ODFW missions and jurisdictions)

(Scale: 5 - high State priority, 1 - low State priority)

How well does the proposed project align with the Oregon Conservation and Nearshore Strategies?

(This would include addressing one or more strategy habitats, species, or key conservation issues)

(Scale: 5 - high alignment - several connections, 1 - low alignment - no or only limited connection)

Does the proposed project support/fill an identified priority need for ODFW ?

(Although a project maybe well aligned to the Strategies, it might not be a high need at this time. In contrast a project may have low alignment with the Strategies, but still be a high need for the Department)

(Scale: 5 - high ODFW priority, 1 - low ODFW priority)

To the best of your knowledge, does the project team have sufficient skill, track record, and/or additional resources/support to accomplish the proposed work?

(Yes, No, Unfamiliar With Applicant)

Staff Review Sheet *(cont.)*

As written, would the proposed project methods be effective at meeting the applicant's stated objectives?

(Scale: 5 - very effective, 1 - ineffective)

As written, would the proposed project costs appropriately accomplish the applicant's stated objectives?

(Scale: 5 - good use of funds, 1 - poor use of funds)

As written, would the proposed project timeline be sufficient to accomplish the applicant's stated objectives?

(Scale: 5 - sufficient , 1 - insufficient)

As written, does the proposed project provide a way to evaluate the success of their work?

(This could be through counting the number of people impacted, evaluating use of structures, data sharing tools for public use, continued monitoring after restoration, etc.)

(Yes/No)

OCRF Advisory Committee Review Process

- Staff reviews are due back to OCRF by April 6th and will be provided to OCRF Advisory Committee members along with Proposals for their consideration while reviewing.
- OCRF Advisory Committee members review assigned proposals (roughly 10-12) and provide reviews back to OCRF staff by April 20th.
- Small group scoring meetings occur April 21st and 22nd – purpose of these meetings are to allow OCRF committee members and ODFW staff time to discuss projects in more detail.
- OCRF staff compile all scores and summary information for OCRF Committee Meeting on May 2nd

Current Project Review Criteria

Current Score	Criterion
0-6	Clarity of the proposal
0-6	Appropriate partnership and demonstration of partner investment
0-6	Measurability
0-6	Outdoor Equity
0-6	Addresses Diversity
0-6 x5	Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities

**Scoring was conducted based on scale:
where 0 was “poor” and 6 was “excellent”**

Proposed Project Review Criteria

Current Score	Proposed Scoring <i>(Total of 75 points)</i>	Criterion
0-6	0-8	Clarity of the proposal
-	0-4	Cost efficiency of the proposed actions
-	0-5	Timeliness and/or have the necessary approvals in place
0-6	0-8	Outdoor Equity
-	0-4	Impact or scale of the proposed actions
0-6	0-9	Appropriate / demonstration of partner investment
0-6	0-8	Measurability
-	0-4	Applicant “track record”
0-6 x5	0-25	Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities
0-6	**	Addresses Diversity for OCRF funding

Clarity (8 points total)

- **Well Presented (0 - 2 points)**
 - *Project is written clearly, with concise sentences, and contains few grammatical/spelling errors.*
- **Organized (0 - 2 points)**
 - *Project has a logical flow with relevant information located together (e.g., background, methods, objectives, etc.)*
- **Clear deliverables (0 - 2 points)**
 - *Project clearly states needs, outcomes, and methods/tools/actions to accomplish the deliverables.*
- **Clear budget (0 - 2 points)**
 - *Project costs are defined, justified, and are relevant to the project deliverables.*

Cost Efficiency (4 points total)

- **Projects that maximize the use of funds to achieve the stated outcomes (0 - 2 points)**
 - *Project costs are sufficient to meet project deliverables and proposed methods/equipment/staff time.*
- **Reasonable application of administrative costs (0 - 2 points)**
 - *Administrative costs are justified based on the type, size, and needs of the requesting organization.*

Timeliness *(5 points total)*

- **Projects that will be implemented quickly**
 - *Projects length is designed to be on the timeline of roughly no longer 1-3 years – if longer length is justified (0 -2 points)*
 - *Projects schedules or order of deliverables are logical and sequential for needs. (0 -2 points)*
- **Projects have necessary approvals in place (0 - 1 point)**
 - *This could include, but are not limited to, collection permits, access permits, transport permits, building permits, land leases, etc.*

OR

 - *If no permits are required, applicant needs to clearly state this within their proposal.*

Outdoor Equity *(8 points total)*

- **Projects engages Oregonians in the solution to a key conservation issue or in recreational opportunities (0 - 2 points)**
- **Projects reach out to and engage people who have not participated in the past because of language barriers, financial barriers, access barriers, etc. (0 - 2 points)**
- **Projects that seek robust engagement with individual youth or underserved individuals, especially projects that are led by traditionally underserved communities and groups. (0 - 2 point)**
- **Projects that seek to close gaps in equitable access to education and opportunities. (0 - 2 point)**

Impact/Scale *(4 points total)*

- **Projects has high impact on participating individuals or the target species or habitat.**
 - Community engagement is clearly defined in the proposal, including but not limited to, education, outreach, extension, services, etc. **(0 - 2 points)**
 - “Impact” on peoples served is described based on identified needs. **(0 - 2 points)**
- OR**
 - Outcomes for target species or habitat are clearly described in the proposal through metric such as number of species, number of individuals, areas of land, etc. **(0 - 2 points)**
 - “Impact” on species and habitat is described based on identified needs. **(0 - 2 points)**

Appropriate/Demonstrated Partnerships

(9 points total)

- **Project engages a variety of partners**
 - Project partners are clearly described, including their roles, relationships, and impacts within their communities of practice and/or place. **(0 - 2 points)**
 - Project partners are appropriate for the deliverables and/or geographic regions where work is proposed. **(0 - 2 points)**
 - Engaging in, and providing funding for, joint projects of the department and the State Parks and Recreation Department or other state agencies as recommended by the Oregon Conservation and Recreation Advisory Committee. **(0 - 1 point)**
- **Project shows commitment from participants (0 - 2 points)**
 - Project participants demonstrate commitment through allocation of resources, such as, but not limited to staff time, funding match, additional supplies/resources, etc.
- **Clear about what each partner has committed to the project (0 - 2 points)**
 - Project participant roles within the project are clearly defined through participation defining needs, achieving deliverables, and/or evaluating project success.

Measurability *(8 points total)*

- **Project identified the ability to quantify the results of the project (0 - 8 points)**

Considerations for evaluation can include:

- Evaluation metrics are clearly defined, either as quantitative (i.e., numbers) or qualitative (e.g., stories, changes in opinion) and justified by project deliverables.
- Resources required for evaluations are described.
- Timeline for evaluations are described and justified – this can fall outside the project/grant timeline.
- Reporting of evaluations is clearly defined.

Track Record of Applicant *(4 points total)*

- Applicant has provided examples of past completed work or needed skills that demonstrate the project team can complete currently proposed work.
(0 - 2 points)
- Applicant is known to their communities of practice or place; this can include but not limited to past work with ODFW, other regional resource managers, regional educational regroups and initiatives, local/regional community outreach programs, etc.
(0 - 2 points)

Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities (25 points total)

Project outcomes align with OCRF Program Priorities identified in the **Expenditure Framework** **AND** are consistent with the **Oregon Conservation Strategy**

(0 - 10 points) General Alignment – for Conservations OR Recreation

(0 - 5 points) “Highest Priority” Areas

(0 - 5 points) Intersection of Conservation and Recreation

(0 - 5 points) Connection to ODFW needs, missions, and recommendations

Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities

(25 points total)

Conservation Focused Projects – General considerations *(0 - 10 points)*

Some key connections:

- Promoting the health of Oregon's ecosystems and fish and wildlife species by implementing conservation programs and strategies identified in the Oregon Conservation Strategy, including conservation programs and strategies for the nearshore identified in the marine component of the Oregon Conservation Strategy;
- Habitat restoration and improving habitat connectivity related to implementing the recommendations in the Oregon Conservation Strategy and evolving science.
- Science, research, and monitoring directly related to implementing the recommendations in the Oregon Conservation Strategy, especially through community science activities.

Also consider other actions/needs as listed in the Conservation Strategies and other Statewide planning documents

Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities

(25 points total)

Recreation Focused Projects – General considerations *(0 - 10 points)*

Some key connections:

- Improving engagement of the public in wildlife watching, hunting and fishing opportunities and in other outdoor recreation opportunities related to and in support of healthy fish, wildlife and habitats
- Improving educational outreach and engagement of the public, including diverse and underserved communities, related to and in support of healthy fish, wildlife and habitats
- Enhancement or restoration of trails and access to waterways in a way that preserves or enhances sensitive habitat or that resolves impacts related to informal or dispersed recreation in sensitive habitat.
- Opportunities to engage and expand the number and diversity of Oregon's outdoor users.
- Opportunities to introduce Oregonians to wildlife-associated recreation.
- Research, planning, or organizational capacity that supports responsible recreational opportunities.

Also consider other actions/needs as listed in the State of Oregon Equity Framework

Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities

(25 points total)

Highest Priority Will Be Given To *(for both Recreation and Conservation):*

- Habitat restoration and improving habitat connectivity related to implementing the recommendations in the Oregon Conservation Strategy and evolving science. **(0 - 1 point)**
- Actions taken within [Conservation Opportunity Areas](#) as defined in the Oregon Conservation Strategy. **(0 - 1 point)**
- Projects related to [ODFW's Wildlife Priority Strategy Species List](#). **(0 - 1 point)**
- Projects that consider impacts of recreation on fish and wildlife habitat. **(0 - 1 point)**
- Projects that include education for users on the impacts of recreation on fish and wildlife habitat. **(0 - 1 point)**

Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities

(25 points total)

Integration/Intersectionality between Conservation and Recreation (0 - 5 points)

Some key connections:

- Projects consider both conservation and recreation in their project assessment of needs, design/methods implementation, and/or evaluation/measurability.
- Projects consider how conservation and recreation can sometimes be at odds and propose project-based solutions alleviate this.

Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities

(25 points total)

Alignment with ODFW needs, missions, and recommendations (0 - 5 points)

Some key connections:

- Consideration of ODFW staff reviews and how State and/or ODFW needs/priorities align with project deliverables.
- Consideration of ODFW staff review comments and questions relate to possible gaps in project design and/or community needs.

Addresses Diversity for OCRF funding

OCRF seeks to make multiple, diverse expenditures in each funding round.

- Diverse geography (east/west, north/south, urban/rural, [OCS ecoregions](#)) – *compared across projects.*
- Diverse taxonomically (fish, reptiles, amphibians, birds, mammals, invertebrates) – *compared across projects.*
- Diverse representation of program priorities (see [Expenditure Framework](#)) – *compared across projects.*
- Diverse partners engaged & included in the overall portfolio – *compared across projects.*

These points are assigned by the whole Advisory Committee once individual and small group scores are made.

Agenda Item 5: OCRF Meeting Break

5min break – Please reconvene at 2:55pm

***Agenda Item 6: 2021 winter/2022 spring Proposal –
Scoring Discussion***

Project Review Criteria

Current Score	Proposed Scoring <i>(Total of 75 points)</i>	Criterion
0-6	0-8	Clarity of the proposal
-	0-4	Cost efficiency of the proposed actions
-	0-5	Timeliness and/or have the necessary approvals in place
0-6	0-8	Outdoor Equity
-	0-4	Impact or scale of the proposed actions
0-6	0-9	Appropriate / demonstration of partner investment
0-6	0-8	Measurability
-	0-4	Applicant “track record”
0-6 x5	0-25	Alignment with OCRF Program Priorities
0-6	**	Addresses Diversity for OCRF funding

Agenda Item 7: Public Comment

Agenda Item 8: OCRF Advisory Committee – Conflict of Interest discussion

Conflict of Interest (COI) vs Content Expert

Content Expert: OCRF Advisory Committee Members inherently know many of the people, places, and community needs within their ecoregions and throughout Oregon.

This knowledge does not necessarily result in a COI for the members when reviewing proposals.

Conflict of Interest (COI)

To constitute a Conflict of Interest (COI) on the behalf of the OCRF committee member one or more of the following would need to have occurred:

- Committee member is named on the proposal as a project applicant or partner
- Committee member directly edited past written versions of the project, or were central in designing the scope of work and/or deliverables
- Committee member directly benefits monetarily or from other forms of value associated products from the proposal
- Committee member actively serves on a board, organization, or other group directly associated with the proposal and/or its project team.
- Committee member has been a receipt (past 3 years) collaborator with the proposal and/or project team – where the professional relationship may be considered to have impact the review.
- Committee member has a personal relationship with a member of the project team.

((This is not an exhaustive list, and OCRF Committee members are requested to discuss any potential COI with Staff and OCRF Chair))

Conflict of Interest (COI)

OCRF Committee Member Considerations:

- *Is there a need to formally adopt or document COI considerations within OCRF guiding documents?*
- *Is there an interest to have applicants sign/acknowledge their own COI?*

***Agenda Item 9: Ongoing Granting – frequency, focuses,
and size of awards***

Agenda Item 10: Meeting Wrap up & Next Steps

2022 Meeting Dates

First Monday of the Month, 1:00-4:00pm

May 2

June 6

July 11

August 8

September 5

October 3

November 7

December 5

Outlook calendar invitations will be sent to board members to aid with scheduling