

Regional Review Team (RRT) Evaluation Questions

All RRTs were asked to provide comments and feedback in the 6 Areas below:

- Area 1: Clarity of the Proposal
- Area 2: Technical Soundness
- Area 3: Watershed Context
- Area 4: Capacity of the Applicant
- Area 5: Alignment with Private Forest Accord Priorities
- Area 6: General Comments.

In addition, RRTs ODFW Staff selected a priority ranking for each project as follows:

- **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.
- **Not Ready for Funding:** The proposal ranks poorly in one or more areas and the benefits of the project are either unclear or unlikely to be realized. These are proposals that demonstrate a lack of urgency and need and fell short of expectations when compared to the review team evaluations.

Private Forest Accord Advisory Committee Scoring Matrix

Criteria Category	Criteria Descriptor	Max Score	Scoring Considerations
Project Match	If match is provided, they receive 1 point	1	Match of any kind provided is eligible and must be awarded 1 point if provided in the application.
Applicant Capacity	Demonstrated capacity	4	Applicant capacity refers to an individual's, organization's, or community's ability/capacity to successfully carry out the proposed activities or responsibilities outlined. A top proposal will include adequate staff assigned and hours predicted, you may also reference the applicant capacity question to learn about project staff and their qualifications. For water projects, consider experience with the Oregon Water Resources Department (OWRD) or other agencies, and ability to manage legal, financial, and reporting requirements.
Clarity of the proposal	Well Presented, Organized, Clear Deliverables and Budget	5	A top proposal would exhibit clarity and organization. Concise sentences and minimal grammatical/spelling errors. It demonstrates a logical flow with relevant information grouped by category (background, methods, objectives, etc.). The proposal effectively articulates the project's needs, desired outcomes, and the specific methods, tools, and actions necessary to achieve its deliverables. Overall, the proposal paints a compelling picture of a well-designed and well-planned project. For water projects, confirm clear description of water right(s), transaction structure, flow benefit, and measurable outcomes. For all projects, a strong proposal will include a well-justified budget and transparent cost estimates.
Technical Soundness	Feasibility and scientific merit of a proposed project's methodology	5	This category refers to the feasibility and scientific merit of a proposed project's methodology, design, data collection, analysis, and interpretation. A top proposal demonstrates a technically sound well-conceived and feasible plan, based on sound scientific principles and conducted by a qualified team with adequate resources. For water projects, include landowner willingness, due diligence completion, and ability to close within required timelines, escrow, and closing. Has the water project demonstrated completeness of documentation (title reports, OWRD forms, transfer applications) and readiness to meet regulatory standards.
Quantitative Metrics and Measurability	Clear plan for tracking progress and demonstrating impact	5	Strong proposals leverage robust quantitative, or qualitative, metrics, offering data-driven proof of progress and justifying resource allocation while demonstrating impact. For water projects, review clarity of flow monitoring, OWRD compliance, and reporting approach. Did the water project submit a monitoring plan?
Cost Effectiveness	Projects that maximize the use of funds to achieve the stated outcomes & reasonable administrative costs	5	A top proposal would be have a budget that demonstrably aligns with the anticipated deliverables. Both the direct costs associated with methods, equipment, and staff time, and the indirect administrative costs, have been carefully determined and are deemed sufficient to support the successful execution of the project. This proposal reflects a demonstrated understanding of the resource requirements specific to the requesting organization's type, size, and unique needs. For water projects, assess the strength of cost justification (comparable, third-party valuations, unit-cost metrics). High scores reflect well-supported, market-consistent valuations and strong justification of public investment.
Alignment with Conservation or Recovery Plans	Alignment with a Recovery Plan or 5-year status review	10	Top proposals demonstrate a direct link or fulfillment of a priority, goal, or limiting factor identified in a state or federal conservation or recovery plan for the targeted PFA anticipated HCP covered species. Specific sections of those conservation/recovery plans are referenced in the project proposal, and the project's purpose, activities, and deliverables clearly address the species' and habitat needs or set the stage for further actions that align with conservation/recovery plans. For water projects, prioritize locations in flow-limited priority basins or those addressing limiting factors for covered species. Evaluate how the proposed water transaction increases instream flow, addresses limiting factors, supports aquatic species life stages, improves water quality, and enhances climate resilience. Does the project align with ODFW Statewide Flow Restoration Prioritization?

Alignment with PFA Priorities	Aligns with one or more of the PFA major categories of mitigation measures identified in the Grant Guidelines.	10	<p>A top proposal will align with one or more of the PFA major categories of success. These categories being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restoring degraded habitat to natural condition/function or a condition likely to improve climate resiliency. 2. Habitat enhancement. 3. Reducing or eliminating threats to HPC-covered species. 4. Creating new habitats or new populations. 5. Translocating affected individuals or family groups to establish new or augment existing populations. 6. Translocating species to enhanced or formerly occupied and still suitable habitat.
Max Points Possible		45	