

**Note:** Dates are subject to change based on implementation of Grant Management System and based on how many applications we receive.

### **Prior to Review**

Review Teams composed and meet to discuss grant program, criteria

### **Grant Solicitation Window Estimate: Open 8-12 weeks ? ?**

- Public Webinar: Monday, September 25<sup>th</sup>, 2023
- Opens: Monday, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2023
- Closes: Monday, November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – *8 week solicitation window*

### **Review Stages**

- **Stage 1:** ODFW conducts initial review
  - **Timeline: ~ 2 weeks (11/21/2023 – 11/30/2023)**
  - Assess applications for eligibility and completion
    1. Disqualified applicants will be returned to applicant with explanation and removed from the review process
  - Compile in master spreadsheet with key information, such as applicant(s), project location, species focus, amount requested, timing, etc.
  - Andy shares with AC and AC members review and identify and Conflict of Interests (
  - ODFW meets with MAC chair and vice chair to divide grants among Review Teams
  - Eligible and complete grants are posted on central grant review website along with spreadsheet
- **Stage 2:** Review Team Assessments
  - **Timeline: ~6 weeks (12/1/2023 – 1/15/2023)**
    1. **State-wide Kickoff meeting held Monday, December 4<sup>th</sup> for 2 or 3 hours and will discuss:**
      - **Defined regions**
      - **Defined # of proposals/region**
      - **Review the process for RTs and offer Q&A**
  - Priority presentation to Review teams by ODFW
  - Each member of review team reviews individually and complete initial ranking
  - Teams meet to discuss reviews applications, inform next tier of review
  - Members finalize reviews on sliding scale as seen below (See below for tentative definitions of each).:
    1. Critical Priority
    2. High Priority
    3. Medium Priority
    4. Low Priority
    5. Fund, but with consideration
    6. Not Ready for Funding.
  - Route all reviews to Salem
  - ODFW compiles and aggregates all individual reviews, forward to MAC.
    1. Following second RT meeting ODFW will collect all individual reviews and assign points to each categorization of review
      - Critical Priority = 5 points
      - High Priority = 4 points
      - Medium Priority = 3 points

- Low Priority = 2 points
- Fund, but with consideration = 1 point
- Not Ready for Funding = 0 points
- 2. ODFW then averages each proposal points and filters them into buckets to finalize project by categories and round to the nearest whole point.
  - Critical = 4.5 – 5
  - High = 3.5 – 4.4
  - Medium = 2.5 – 3.4
  - Low = 1.5 – 2.4
  - Fund, but with considerations = 0.5 – 1.4
  - Not ready for funding = 0
- **Stage 3: MAC Review**
  - **Timeline: 3 weeks (1/15/23 – 1/29/23)**
    1. **Week 1: ODFW compiles regional reviews & delivers packets to MAC**
    2. **Weeks 1-3: MAC reviews packets**
    3. **Week 3: In-person 2-day MAC meeting**
      - **Presentations by RTs**
      - **MAC voting & recommendation**
      - **MAC in-person meeting set for February 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup>**
  - MAC members receive aggregated Review Team findings and meet to make decisions on grant awards. The recommendation is forwarded to ODFW and then the Commission. The MAC may hold additional meetings as needed to finalize any recommendations to Commission
    1. Review Team representative (ODFW Stream Bio) present at the MAC meeting to answer questions and present to the MAC
      - Review Team rep. presents on regional projects to the MAC
        - Rep will present on each submitted project which covers high level overview. ALL projects are presented on – unless overabundance of proposals submitted than cherry pick projects presented.
          - Andy will QA/QC consistency on information presented for fairness.
        - Following all regional presentations the MAC will discuss
    2. Post-presentation to MAC
      - MAC members vote anonymously using voting software to allocate points to a proposal
        - Each MAC member gets “X” amount of points to award projects (and either they can only assign one or multiple points/project)
        - MAC takes break and ODFW aggregates points in order of preference than attaches total funding request to each proposal and draws cutoff where funding is lost.
          - MAC can bring up projects for funding that didn’t make the funding list as agreed on
- **Stage 4: Optional:** MAC direction to ODFW for further analysis and advice on awards, in consultation with federal agencies and other relevant experts – as needed.
- **Stage 5:** If Stage 4 is used, then materials return to MAC review, discussion and recommendation to ODFW and Commission
- **Stage 6:** Commission

- **Date: March Commission meeting**
  1. **February spent preparing packets for Commission and interface with applicants as needed.**

### **Review team regionality**

- TBD once proposals are in.
- Assume 3 regions.

### **Review Teams – 3 total**

- Team makeup – Final decision by the Chairs on region breakup and RT seats based on technical need
  - 1-3 MAC /region
  - 1-2 ODFW /region
    - Stream Bio
    -
  - 1 USFWS /region - *pending*
  - 1 NOAA/region - *confirmed*
  - 1 ODF/region - *pending*
  - **HOLD** – 1 - 2 seat at large as needed and based on technical need
- Meetings commitments
  - Assume 3 meetings
    - Meeting 1: Review team meet and greet/intro meeting ~2or 3 hours (assume Fall 2023)
    - Meeting 2: Review team discussion about proposals reviewed ~6 hours (Assume Late fall 2023 or early winter 2024)
    - Meeting 3: Presentation to MAC ~30 min - 1 hr/region (Assume early winter 2024); may not need all RT members to participate

### **Defining Stage 2 review categories:**

- Critical Priority
  - The proposal ranks highly on all review areas and thus promises a high likelihood of significant benefits to covered species.
- High Priority
  - The proposal ranks highly in almost all review areas, and concerns are minor and likely to be easy to address.
- Medium Priority
  - The proposal ranks high in some areas but only moderately or poorly in others.
- Low Priority

- The proposal ranks poorly in one or more areas, and concerns are sufficient to suggest concern about the potential success of the proposal.
- Fund, but with consideration
  - These are projects that demonstrate a lack of urgency and need. They may still be an important project but the applicant may not have properly demonstrated a necessary level of ~~the~~ importance/urgency properly. The project may still need additional revisions and additions to complete its desired outcome. The reviewer should provide details as to why this is important and what should be modified or added to create better value. These projects fell short of expectations when compared to the review team evaluation sheets.
- Not Ready for Funding
  - The project ranks poorly in one or more areas and the benefits of the project are either unclear or unlikely to be realized.

**OLD language:**

- Critical Priority
  - A project with an objective that is of critical time, factor, or situation. If the project is not funded immediately it risks severe consequences for the species and/or watershed. These projects usually demonstrate a very high value and surpassed expectations when compared to the review team evaluation sheets.
- High Priority
  - A project of regional or statewide significance that identifies and links project outcomes to strategic objectives. The project demonstrates time sensitivity and high urgency, and without funding could result in undesirable consequences. These projects met expectations when compared to the review team evaluation sheets.
- Medium Priority
  - These projects are necessary but are not the most important at present. Projects should still demonstrate an urgency and connection to local or regional plans but a lack of funding will not result in major consequences. These projects adequately met expectations when compared to the review team evaluation sheets.
- Low Priority
  - Although important, these projects are not time sensitive and do not result in a high value output. A lack of funding would not result in a measurable consequence. These projects fell short of some expectations when compared to the review team evaluation sheets.
- Fund, but with consideration

- These are projects that demonstrate a lack of urgency and need. They may still be important but the applicant may not have properly demonstrated the importance properly. The project may still need additional revisions and additions to complete it's desired outcome. The reviewer should provide details as to why this is important and what should be modified or added to create better value. These projects fell short of expectations when compared to the review team evaluation sheets.
  
- Not Ready for Funding
  - These projects demonstrate a lack of merit and are not ready for funding considerations. These projects did not meet expectations when compared to the review team evaluation sheets.