

## MAG Enhancement Funds Working Group Process for Review and Ranking of Applications<sup>1</sup>

- I. Each enhancement fund cycle, three meetings of the EFWG are scheduled to review and rank applications. The first meeting focuses on reviewing applications. Applicants may be asked questions about their application and may be asked to make changes to their application based on the expertise of the EFWG. The second meeting provides for additional review of applications (if needed), discussion of issues or questions raised regarding applications at the first meeting, and ranking of applications. A third meeting is scheduled, if necessary, to allow additional opportunity for application ranking.
- II. A list showing the order that applications will be reviewed at the EFWG meetings is provided on the EFWG agenda. Providing the list allows applicants to make the best use of their time in attending EFWG meetings. The applications will be reviewed in the order received by MAG staff.
- III. The review of applications occurs as follows:
  - A. Brief introduction by MAG staff explaining how the application fits into the federal legislation.
  - B. Five minute presentation provided by the applicant.
  - C. Maximum public comment period of five minutes for each application, following the presentation provided by the applicant.
  - D. 10 minute question-and-answer period led by EFWG co-chairs.
  - E. Applicants are required to submit a written response to comments raised by EFWG members prior to the next meeting. The written response should be directed to MAG staff.
- IV. Meetings of the Enhancement Funds Working Group provide two opportunities for public comment: during the “call to the audience” and on each action item. During the Call to the Audience, speakers have three minutes to provide comment on any nonagenda item that is within the jurisdiction of MAG, as well as any nonaction agenda item. This opportunity is generally held at the beginning of the meeting prior to any other actions.

In addition, speakers are given three minutes to speak on any action item (three minutes per item). If a speaker does not believe he/she can adequately cover their concerns in the three-minute time frame, written comments are always accepted. The Chair has the discretion to extend or limit citizen comment periods. However, the discretion to limit public comment should be exercised cautiously and implemented only in cases in which the work of the body

---

<sup>1</sup> This guidance was originally adopted by the Enhancement Funds Working Group on March 22, 2002 and was revised on April 6, 2004.

would be jeopardized by allowing citizen comment (i.e., if the committee is in imminent danger of losing a quorum).

The Chair has the power to enforce the speaking rules, as outlined on the MAG comment cards, and to revoke speaking rights if any violation of the speaking rules occurs. The Chair may revoke an individual's rights to speak if the individual twice refuses to be silent after being directed to do so. (If an individual loses the right to speak, he/she may still present written comments.)

- V. To rank applications:
  - A. Committee members anonymously complete ballots provided by MAG staff.
  - B. MAG staff compiles and calculates initial rankings. A brief break in the meeting is typically called to allow time for the calculations.
  - C. EFWG discusses initial ranking with no additional opportunity for public input. Note that an opportunity for public input is provided before committee discussion of the ranking item.
  
- VI. To address the issue of multiple applications submitted by one member agency, each member agency submitting more than one application is requested to submit a letter to MAG staff indicating the priority ranking of the projects submitted. This information is **not required**.