



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
1111 Washington Street SE  
PO Box 40917  
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

March 27, 2006

**TO:** SRFB Members and Designees  
**FROM:** Laura E. Johnson, Director *LEJ*  
**PREPARED BY:** Neil Aaland, Assistant Director, Project Services *na*  
**SUBJECT:** Seventh Round Operational Schedule and Issues

**Background**

The Issues Task Force (ITF) has made recommendations to the SRFB on allocating funding on a regional basis. These recommendations are discussed in a separate memo from Steve Tharinger, ITF Chair, to the Board (see agenda item 3a). Using those recommendations as a guide, we have developed a draft timeline and process that covers the operational aspects of implementing the 2006 (Seventh) Round.

**2006 SRFB Grant Round Outline**

***Suggested Timeline***

- April 6-7 • SRFB approves 7<sup>th</sup> Round process
- April 10 • Staff initiate Review Panel solicitation, begin updating policy and application Manuals
- May, date TBA • Workshop for lead entities and regions, to explain the new elements of the 7<sup>th</sup> grant round
- June 8-9 (SRFB meeting) • Final 7<sup>th</sup> Round policy & application Manuals and detailed timeline approved
- June 12 • Application materials available
- July – Sept • SRFB Review Panel available (technical assistance and preliminary “Project of Concern” identification)
- September – date TBA • Application materials, regional project lists, and answers to questionnaire (see below) **due to SRFB** i.e., in the PRISM system



- |              |  |
|--------------|--|
| September    | • Review Panel's final evaluation of POC's with applicants and lead entities   |
| October      | • Regional and area presentations to SRFB staff/Review Panel                   |
| Mid-November | • Final report prepared by SRFB/RP staff, published and available for comments |
| Dec. 5-6:    | • <b>SRFB funding meeting</b>  |

### **Forms and Eligibility**

The SRFB Manuals for the 2006 Grant Round are likely to be virtually identical to the formats and eligibility guidance provided in the last several grant rounds. In June, the SRFB can make its final determination regarding the types of projects eligible to apply for funding. However, staff is likely to recommend that the Board consider making assessments an ineligible project type for this grant round. The only exception would be for assessments that are needed to fill a data gap identified in a regional recovery plan.

The Board has funded over 290 assessments since its inception. There has been no overview of the nature and results of those assessments so far. Under discussion Item # 4, later in the meeting, the Board will be reviewing a proposal for an 'assessment of assessments'. Note that staff will recommend that project design and engineering-type feasibility studies continue to be eligible for funding.

### **SRFB Review Panel**

Membership and Composition: There would be a five member Review Panel, plus the non-voting GSRO-based chair/convener. The basic function of the Panel would be to provide technical assistance and project review during the grant round.

The Board may also wish to consider engaging the Review Panel, during and after the grant round, to serve as a standing panel. This would be for project technical assistance for SRFB administration, to offer a resource for objective "third party opinions". A standing Review Panel might also be able to assist with (or perhaps serve in lieu of) the SRFB Administration Sub-Committee's process for reviewing amendment requests.

#### **a. General role of Review Panel, 2006 Round**

1. Review Panel to be available upon request, for participation in local review processes and early project review/site visits

2. For restoration-type proposals, sponsors must provide adequate information to the Review Panel. This can be provided either through invitation to a site visit or by submitting detailed written information.
3. Sponsors could receive one evaluation form from site visit and one final evaluation form following final submission (i.e. one fix-it loop)

The Review Panel will provide a different level of review for areas covered by regional recovery plans and for areas not included in a regional recovery plan (coastal and northeast lead entities):

- b. Role of SRFB Review Panel in the areas covered by regional recovery plans:
  1. Technical review of projects only – Identify Projects of Concern (“POCs”)
  2. Participate upon request in local review processes, early project review
  3. SRFB’s existing Benefit & Certainty criteria would be used in project review and evaluation
- c. Role of SRFB Review Panel in areas not covered by regional recovery plans, that is, for the coastal and northeast lead entities:
  1. Review the project lists for fit to strategy
  2. Identify POCs
  3. Participate upon request in local review processes, early project review
  4. SRFB’s existing Benefit & Certainty criteria would be used in project review and evaluation

### **Questionnaire for the Regional Areas:**

In previous grant rounds, each Lead Entity submitted a statement with its ranked list of proposals. The statement set out a summary of the Lead Entity’s strategy and how it used that strategic approach in rating and ranking its project proposals. This approach will continue to be used in the Coastal and Northeast areas.

Because of the 2006 Round’s emphasis on a regional perspective, it is recommended that each regional area prepare a similar statement for the SRFB. This questionnaire would allow the SRFB to understand how the region’s allocation process worked and how local decisions were made. It is important to assist the SRFB in evaluating how well the regions are implementing their recovery plan, as discussed in Steve Tharinger’s memo of March 24, 2006 to the SRFB.

Answers to the questions will be included in the final report from the SRFB’s Review Panel and presented to the SRFB at its funding meeting in December.

The questions to be answered by each region are:

1. How were projects solicited? This includes a discussion of the watershed-level and regional level public participation opportunities and processes as well as how conflicts of interest were addressed.

2. Explain the scoring criteria and evaluation process, and provide scoring criteria and allocation model if used.
3. How does the region's recommend project list fit its recovery plan or strategies? Submit habitat work schedules if available.
4. How does the current project list complement past restoration actions and future implementation goals?
5. What other funding resources are being utilized to recover salmon in your region?

The Board should identify any other questions to be addressed by the Regions.

### **Staff Recommendation**

SRFB members should discuss the outline and processes contained in this memo and make decisions on the operational aspects of the 7<sup>th</sup> round. Based on direction at the April meeting, we will come back in June for final approval of Manuals, application materials, and details on specific dates.