Title: Multistate Conservation Grant Program (MSCGP)

Desired Outcome: Board approval of joint staff and Partnership Committee recommendations for developing the 2016 (and beyond) MSCGP application for funding consideration

Background: At its November 2014 meeting, the Board charged the Partnership Committee with soliciting feedback from the FHPs regarding future MSCGP application submissions. Board staff worked with the Partnership Committee chairs to develop and administer a survey to the FHPs in January 2015. During its January 2015 call the Board tasked staff with providing recommendations for an approach to future MSCGP grant processes for Board consideration in March. The 2015 Board approved Priority Task B is as follows: Development of a process for building consensus support among FHPs for funding proposals (e.g. MSCGP and other sources) submitted by the Board on their behalf; (assign to Board staff and Partnership Committee).

The survey instrument included six questions delivered via Survey Monkey during the week of January 5, 2015. Survey questions included:

1) Which of the 19 Board recognized Fish Habitat Partnerships do you represent?

2) In your opinion, should the FHPs and the NFHP Board continue to submit a combined proposal for MSCG funding?

3) Are you satisfied with the previous (combined) proposal development process and subsequent allocation of Multistate Conservation Grant (MSCG) funds the NFHP Board used during the past three years?

4) Would you (the FHP you represent) like more involvement or oversight in the Board's MSCG proposal development process?

5) Should the NFHP Partnership Committee be more involved in overseeing or completing the Board's MSCG proposal? If yes, please describe what role the Partnership Committee should have as well as the extent of its involvement.

6) Are you satisfied with the focus of MSCG from the past three years? If not, what alternative focus do you advocate?

Summary of FHP Survey Results

- Overall, the FHPs were satisfied with previous (combined) proposal development process and subsequent allocation of MSCGP funds. They were also satisfied with the focus of the combined proposal.

DRAFT

- All FHPs that responded to the survey believe that the NFHP Board should continue to submit a combined proposal for MSCGP funding consideration.
- About half of the FHP respondents would like more involvement in the application development process, and about half don't desire increased involvement in the process. One FHP had no opinion.
- About half of the FHP respondents had no opinion regarding whether the NFHP Partnership Committee should be more involved in overseeing or completing the Board's MSCGP proposal. Of the remaining FHPs more were in favor of more NFHP Partnership Committee involvement than not.

Recommendations to the Board: Based on the responses from 11 of 19 Board recognized FHPs, the Committee developed the following recommendations for Board consideration:

- The Board should continue to develop joint MSCGP proposals for 2016 funding consideration (and beyond) on behalf of the FHPs that desire to participate.
- A regional geographic approach should be taken to develop the joint project proposal.
- The joint proposal should request a total of $1.5 million dollars to cover project costs over a three year period (~$500k/year).
- Identify fiscal administration efficiencies for any funds NFHP may receive through the MSCGP.
- Use the process (reviewed and recommended by the Partnership Committee) for executing the MSCG process, annually.

Recommended Process (Timeline may vary slightly based on AFWA schedule)

Timeline	**Board Action**
Nov - Feb	Board Staff solicits input from the Partnership Committee on NFHP NCN.
March - April	NCN's selected in March by AFWA Grants Committee
	FHPs begin to identify needs/priority projects and self-select regional groups based on similar needs and/or proposed projects goals.

DRAFT

	The Board staff contacts the FHPs to solicit proposed projects and begin developing the Letter of Intent (LOI). Note: If the FHPs haven't self-selected regional groupings, then grouping will be developed based on common themes contained among the proposed projects and input provided by the FHPs.
	Draft LOI provided to the FHPs for review and comment
May -June	Joint NFHP and FHP LOI submitted for consideration
	Board staff identifies potential fiscal agents for each of the regional groups
	Board staff begins developing draft full proposal for funding consideration
July	LOIs selected for full proposal
	Draft proposal is provided to the FHPs for review and comment
	Comments and edits are incorporated into final proposal
August	Joint NFHP and FHP full proposal submitted for funding consideration

Briefing book Materials: Tab 4b –Summary survey results

DRAFT