

September 7, 2010
 KPFHP Steering Committee Meeting
 11 AM - NOON
 Location: USFWS Offices, K-Beach Road, Soldotna

Present	Teleconference	Absent
Robert Ruffner, KWF	Marie McCarty, KHLT	Peter Micciche, COS
Rhonda Orth, KWF	Shawn Stash, USFS	
Ginny Litchfield, ADF&G	Sue Mauger, CIK	
Mike Edwards, USFWS	Doug Limpinsel, NOAA	
Ken Tarbox, retired ADF&G	Ricky Gease, KRSA (11:23)	

Were notes from last meeting sufficient in level of detail? YES

Mike/Shawn/Peter merged the MatSu document with their criteria to create Attachment 3 (Ranking Criteria). Suggested changes to Attachment 3 were discussed and agreed upon:

- 1) Add 5th Section for Partnership? NO
 Would increase point value
 Does this imply a partnership over individual/organization would receive more points? YES
 It helps to clarify how many people/agencies are involved
 Rewards people for partnering with with others
 This issue is encompassed in Section 4, Bullet 2
- 2) Section 4, Bullet 3 needs clarification – “supporters” is not clear
 Change sentence to read something like: “Education component of the project targets a specific group relative to the projects purpose” Robert to incorporate change of wording for sentence to this intent.
- 3) Section 4, Add Bullet 4 to read: “Does the proposal include non-traditional partners? [examples: ATV users, snomads, equestrians, etc]
- 4) Section 3, Bullet 3 - DELETE
 Does this reward someone already given a project? YES
 Intent is to NOT reward bad behavior from prior award/project
 This can be included in the consideration of Section 2, Bullet 2

(Ricky joined via teleconference)

- 5) Eligibility, Bullet 1 – DELETE
- 6) Eligibility, Bullet 2 – “improved” is too generalized
 Replace “improved” with “maintaining and restoring”

This is more in line with mission statement

- 7) Point values for each portion suggested and discussed.
Final consensus: Project Design = 60, Project Cost = 10, Applicant Abilities and Capacity = 30, Education-Outreach = 10

Suggested changes to Attachment 2 (Format for KPHFP NFHAP Project Requests) were discussed and agreed upon:

- 1) Need a reference to the webpage on this document
- 2) Project Narrative, SubBullet 2, Methods
It appears these were written from construction angle, not research
CDFA does not allow research projects per se
No reference to reports or reporting schedule
Change sentence to read: "Methods; clearly describe proposed methods, approach and written products."
- 3) Project Narrative, SubBullet 2, Proposed Timeline
Should a reporting schedule be added to timeline requirements?
- 4) Project Narrative, SubBullet 7, Applicant abilities and capacity
Add "including list of resumes of assigned scientists"

Can there be a specific all for proposals if more funding is provided?
The Steering Committee can narrow the focus for applications

Suggested changes to 2011 NFHAP Project Application and Selection Guide were discussed and agreed upon:

- 1) Page 3 - "What do I need to know to get started after my project is selected for funding? - 1st sentence needs clarified
Applicant needs to pay up front apply for reimbursement
This is typical procedure
Can get advance under special consideration
- 2) Page 3, "Is there a recommended format for a NFHAP project idea?"
Should the Attachments be renamed?
Refer to the Attachment document name in parenthesis:
Attachment 1 (Project Summary)
Attachment 2 (Project Request Form)
Attachment 3 (Ranking Criteria)
Delete sentence: "Use a readable font size (11-12) for both documents"
- 3) Create a new section titled "Are there reporting requirements?"
Mike will type up and submit to Robert for inclusion of draft

- 4) Page 2, "When are project requests due?"
Can the timeline be changed?
Deadline too soon after release of final draft
Change deadline to October 15 in all references of documents

Robert to make all revisions today and email out to Committee for review

Final Form on Monday? Depends
Schedule "Day of Discussion" – then "Call to Question" on Thursday

Policies and Procedures Document – Not enough time for Committee to review

Summary of changes: Shortened document a lot
Conflict of interest section needs work
Shortened committee section

Please review with "What questions need to be answered" by document

Is each Steering member a Director? YES

Need to remove references to "Director"

Elections – Implies the Steering Committee elects the Steering Committee

Should Partnership elect members for Steering Committee

A lot of clarification would be needed

A lot of voting issues would be involved

Need to approach entire document piecemeal at next meeting

Last meeting letter to the Board was to be written by Robert.

That same day an email came out with a revised schedule from the Board

No letter was written due to email with time adjustment

Revised schedule dates – Robert will forward email

Key Dates: Oct 1st Second Draft sent out

Allows 15 days for comments

1st Draft – AK was not on the map or in the text

Today email was received assigning scientists to partnerships

KPFHP was assigned Gary Whelan

Good news for us - he has been more engaged than others

Also assigned to Michigan

Few partnerships have circulated comments for others to see

Robert can forward to anyone who is interested – Ken

Desert Fish has the best one

NEXT MEETING: September 21st

October 5th Meeting – Will review 2nd draft for comments

October 19th Meeting - Will review proposals

Robert will be gone the entire month of November

Anyone attending the MatSu meeting in November? Mike and Su