



STATE OF WASHINGTON

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

August 29, 2006

TO: SRFB Members and Designees

FROM: Laura E. Johnson, Director *LEJ*

PREPARED BY: Neil Aaland, Assistant Director *na*
Steve Leider, Review Panel Team Leader

SUBJECT: 2006 Grant Round - Update

What's been happening?

The seven-member SRFB Review Panel (Panel) coalesced and commenced work in mid-June. Since that time most of the Panel's work has been focused on examining projects in the field and providing preliminary comments to applicants to assist them in developing higher quality projects. Twenty-five of the 26 lead entities have requested the services of the Panel through September 7.

To date the Panel has reviewed 161 projects, of which 47 have been identified as potential projects of concern (PPOC) for various reasons. The number of PPOCs at this stage of the process is a bit less than last year, when 52 projects were identified as PPOCs. The number of projects reviewed in a single lead entity has varied from two to 36. The total number of proposed projects submitted on September 18 will likely exceed approximately 150 projects. See Table 1 for more details.

To date, the Panel has been invited to participate in an oversight role to learn more about the process used to identify, evaluate, rate and rank projects consistent with the recovery plans in three (lower Columbia, Upper Columbia, Snake) of the seven salmon recovery regions having recovery plans (see Table 1).

The Panel will meet on October 19-20 to discuss all submitted projects. From October 23-27 a series of meetings are being scheduled at which the Panel will receive presentations from lead entities and/or regional organizations, as appropriate, to discuss remaining potential projects of concern and to clarify the various processes used and how projects lists relate to recovery plans or lead entity strategies. The Panel will prepare their draft report of findings including draft POCs and results of oversight activities, in early November. The final Panel report will be completed in mid-November.



How are things going?

In general the Panel has functioned very well and both lead entities and project applicants have found the services of the Panel to be highly beneficial. At least one Panel member was available to visit each of the proposed projects. Where only one Panel member was available the respective SRFB project manager for that geographic area assisted the Panel by reviewing and commenting on the Panel members' project evaluation form for each project. The Panel has the option to use this input to add perspective on the project.

What information will go into the draft and final reports and how will it be organized?

We anticipate the draft and final reports will be structured similar to last year, but with some differences resulting from the changes in process. The reports will be prepared by the Review Panel and by SRFB/IAC staff and organized in four major parts.

Part I. Introduction

This section will outline the context, process, and changes from past rounds.

Part II. Review Panel's evaluation of projects and process

Projects of Concern will be identified and reported using the same benefit and certainty criteria and approaches as last year.

Last year, the Panel evaluated projects, quality of lead entity strategies, and fit of the project list to either the strategy or the regional recovery plan. No attempt was made to assess the quality of a regional recovery plan; the assumption was that the existing recovery plan review processes would cover that. Since most of the regional recovery plans had not yet been submitted, most lead entities still submitted their strategies as the basis for their project lists.

This year is quite different. The regional recovery plans have now all been submitted to NOAA, and only five lead entities¹ will be reviewed based on strategies where no recovery plans have been developed. Therefore, for most of the state the primary focus of the Review Panel is to evaluate projects and begin to serve in an "oversight" role. In their "oversight" role the Panel will not evaluate recovery plans or the fit of project lists to those plans, but will provide comments in response to the key questions in the Review Panel "oversight" checklist, Manual 18, Appendix D.

The basis for the Panel's project evaluations and other comments will include:

- Project site visits from this summer;
- Observations from attendance at the local technical and citizens committee project evaluation and ranking processes used by the lead entities and/or regional organizations;
- Information Submission Questionnaire, Manual 18, pages 24-25, submitted by lead entities and regional organizations;

¹ Pacific, Grays Harbor, Quinault, Pend Oreille, and Klickitat Lead Entities

For lead entities not covered by a regional salmon recovery plan the Review Panel will evaluate strategy quality and fit of lists to strategies using the template in Manual 18, Appendix E; and

- Information from the October 23-27 presentations by lead entities and/or regional organizations.

In brief, instead of emphasizing ratings of the strategy quality or fit of project lists to lead entity strategies, this part of the report will provide unrated narrative responses to the Information Submission Questionnaires. The only evaluation and rating of strategies will be for those lead entities not included in a regional recovery plan.

Part III. Staff report

Last year, Part III of the report contained analysis by staff of information generated by the Review Panel, patterns in that information, and recommendations on how the SRFB could allocate the funding to each lead entity. Different scenarios for funding were provided, based on fit of the project list to the strategy or recovery plan, and strategy quality, along with the Review Panel comments.

This year, the allocations have already been made by the SRFB to the various regional areas (including those with the lead entities not involved in regional recovery plans). Therefore, a new component for this report will be comparing how the various processes actually occurred to the descriptions submitted by regional organizations and lead entities in their "homework" assignments that were submitted to the SRFB earlier this year. This will include reviewing any explanations for why things were done differently than proposed, and how this new system worked.

In summary, the staff report will utilize:

- All of the information provided by the Review Panel;
- The responses to the homework assignment from the April 2006 SRFB meeting; and
- Available SRFB criteria in laying out options and recommendations

Part IV. Next Steps

This section outlines report distribution, access, and review timelines as appropriate.

Considerations for the SRFB

- Do you concur with the approach and report content?
- Do you want to provide any further guidance on criteria for development of options and/or staff recommendations?

Table 1. SRFB 2006 (7th Round) Review Panel Site Visits

REGIONS & Lead Entities	Review Panel Site Visit Dates	Comments	Projects		
			Panel reviewed	Preliminary POCs	Proposed on Sep. 18
LOWER COLUMBIA	6/16/2006				
	6/19/2006				
	6/20/2006				
	6/21/2006				
	6/23/2006				
	6/26/2006				
	6/29/2006				
	6/30/2006				
	8/23/2006	Oversight; final TAC ranking	18	4	18
Snohomish County	7/10/2006		9	3	6
Quinault Nation	7/12/2006		6	3	4
Skagit Watershed C.	7/14/2006		7	0	7
Stillaguamish Tribe	7/17/2006		6	5	5
Grays Harbor County	7/17/2006		3	0	3
San Juan County	7/21/2006		5	4	5
NOPLÉ	7/25/2006		6	2	6
NOPLÉ (WRIA 20)	7/25-26/2006		1	1	1
Island county	7/26/2006		2	0	2
SNAKE RIVER	7/26/2006	Oversight in early Sep.	17	12	14
King County WRIA 9	8/2/2006		4	2	4
Nisqually River S.R.	8/3/2006		2	0	2
Yakima River Fish & Wildlife Bd.	8/3-4/2006		14	3	11
King County WRIA 8	8/8/2006		3	0	2
Klickitat County	8/15/2006		2	0	2
Lummi (WRIA 1, Nooksack)	8/16/2006		4	2	4
Pierce County	8/17/2006		4	0	4
HOOD CANAL	8/17/2006		9	0	9
Pacific County	8/18/2006		2	1	2
UPPER COLUMBIA	8/18/2006	Aug. 18 technical oversight; Sep. 7 CAG ranking oversight	23	5	23
Thurston CD	8/24/2006		4	?	4
Mason CD	8/24/2006		5	?	5
NORTHEAST (Pend O.)	8/30/2006		?	?	3
Kitsap (East) County	9/7/2006		?	?	3
TOTAL			161	47	149