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Purpose

- These are the key objectives for this project:
  - Create source material for preparing desk manuals (i.e., process maps).
  - There is a legislative mandate in the current budget to do this project.
  - Address grantee concerns about delays and costs with regards to RCO business practices.
  - OFM has been concerned about reappropriations due to grantees taking too long to get projects off the ground. Project appropriations have frequently crossed over into subsequent budget years.
  - A desire from RCO management for more consistency in business practices across programs. This will facilitate training the many new staff at RCO in a common RCO way of doing business.
Approach

- The RCO staff, facilitated by the consultants, accomplished the following tasks in support of this project:
  - Interviewed RCO managers,
  - Conducted a focus group of RCO applicants and grantees,
  - Obtained existing process maps and converted them into visio format,
  - Identified business processes to map and redesign,
  - Scheduled and conducted work sessions with RCO staff where current business processes were mapped,
  - Shadowed RCO staff to view how systems and forms are used,
  - Prepared As-Is process maps,
  - Conducted a workshop to identify redesign ideas,
  - Conducted two workshops to refine redesign recommendations,
  - Prepared To-Be (or proposed) process maps, and
  - Prepared this report.
Roster of participants

- These RCO staffpersons participated in interviews and/or workshops:
  - Brian Abbott
  - Lorinda Anderson
  - Jim Anest
  - Marguerite Austin
  - Kammie Bunes
  - Scott Chapman
  - Adam Cole
  - Patty Dickason
  - Marc Duboiski
  - Tara Galuska
  - Mark Jarasitis
  - Darrell Jennings
  - Rachael Langen
  - Robbie Marchesano
  - Scott Robinson
  - Leslie Ryan-Connelly

- A special note of thanks goes out to Scott Chapman who was instrumental and effective in scheduling meetings and workshops, facilitating the flow of material and work products, and providing support to the project.
Findings

- **Overall R&C and SRFB Processes**
  - While understanding that the process is sometimes statutorily driven, sponsors also report that the duration of the grant making process is too long.
  - Process maps show several examples of multiple and redundant reviews of applications and contract documents.
  - Long time lags in completing grants creates the need for reappropriations because projects change by the time funds are ready.
  - Sponsors report that presentations are an expensive burden for many organizations.
  - Processing reimbursements take too long.

- **Pre-app and application processes**
  - SRFB does quarterly review panels while R&C does annual panels.
  - SRFB application vetting is done by external entities while R&C staff review applications.
  - Process maps show multiple handoffs and sequential processing of comment forms during the early comment period.
Findings

- **Application process**
  - Applications can be submitted when incomplete – there is no editing to ensure that fields are completed.
  - Concurrent application deadlines for different programs result in heavy workload spikes for RCO grant managers. Summer deadlines greatly impact some sponsors who have heavy programmatic schedules in the summer.
  - Comprehensive plans are checked and verified late in the process which results in some application denials after substantial review time has already been performed.
  - Several review steps occur in this process even before applications are deemed complete.

- **Evaluation & Award process**
  - Paper score sheets are used in several, sequential processing steps by multiple players resulting in multiple handoffs.
  - Projects that use grants for matching funds end up having multiple grant managers (one for the main project, one for the match).
  - Sponsors express frustration about the cost and disruption of live presentations.
  - Much of the SRFB evaluation process is handled by local entities whereas R&C evaluations are handled by RCO staff.
Findings

- Agreement process
  - R&C agreements require much more documentation than SRFB agreements. Need to consider what is gained from the added documentation.
  - SRFB milestones can be solicited in the application thereby saving a step in the agreement process.
  - SRFB grants more time to sponsors for obtaining additional documents whereas R&C will cancel the agreement if all documentation is not available.
  - Agreements are routed in paper form and require multiple handoffs, reviews and signatures. The use of workflow technology and document sharing technology can improve this process. In addition, reducing signature requirements can expedite agreements.
  - Agreements are stored in triplicate: PRISM, project file, and chrono. This is too much redundancy.
  - The fiscal review step of the process is probably unnecessary.
  - Sponsors sometimes delay executing agreements even after the project has started.
  - Many amendments are the result of errors made during the agreement process.
Findings

- Amendment (time extension) process
  - Amendments are routed in paper form and require multiple handoffs, reviews and signatures. The use of workflow technology and document sharing technology can improve this. In addition, reducing signature requirements can expedite agreements.
  - Many amendments are needed for mundane or simple errors in agreements and could be expedited through a lower level of review and approval.
Findings

- Interim reimbursements process
  - Sponsors report up to 6 months to obtain reimbursements.
  - The process features multiple handoffs and reviews of paper-based billing packets.
  - 50% of incoming invoices are incomplete resulting in unnecessary follow-up and denials.
  - Many invoice denials are the indirect result of contracts that are overly prescriptive with regard to project inputs (which are likely to change over the life of the project) rather than project outcomes (which vary much less). Changing the contract model to be more outcome oriented may reduce the volume of minor billing discrepancies. Agreements can also include contingencies for minor, undetermined charges.
  - 300 sponsors did not submit an invoice last year (as required by the Feds).
  - The PRISM-AFRS interface is not automated, a problem especially for the manual payment data entry.
Recommended Projects

The next several pages describe the redesign projects as they were created by the RCO groups facilitated by the consultants. Each project is presented in a grid format as shown below. There are 23 redesign projects in all. They are numbered consecutively according to how they were originally proposed as potential projects. However some numbers are skipped. This is because certain projects were either combined with others or eliminated from consideration. At the end of the proposed projects are three additional projects that the consultants presented. These two were not adopted by the RCO staff but are presented here for future consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> This section describes the project and how it would be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong> This section describes the service, efficiency or outcome benefits that may accrue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting findings:</strong> This section refers to the findings that were developed by the consultants based on interviews, analysis of process maps and the focus group. The section may also refer to the As-Is (or current) process maps found in Appendix C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/Timeline:</strong> This section describes the proposed timeline or priority for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation considerations/barriers:</strong> This section describes implementation requirements, policy considerations, potential IT modifications and other issues that will have to be addressed for implementation. It also describes any barriers that may appear with sponsors, RCO boards and so on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommended Projects

#### Project 1 - Implement alternating grant cycles

**Description:** Some Recreation and Conservation grant program would award grants in alternating years, once per biennium, rather than annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Allow staff to focus on grant management and prioritize workload.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives:</strong></td>
<td>Just changes the timing of when applications are processed – not total workload.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 1 and 2 Overall Grant Processes. Evaluating and awarding grants in alternating years would not reduce the overall grant volume but would allow grant managers to focus on fewer grant programs at one time.

**Priority/Timeline:**
Implement for BFP Local and NOVA for 2011-13 funding cycle.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Minimal. Could save costs for applicants b/c they can combine funding requests.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Resistance from sponsors who must wait a year to apply.
- Should be implemented ASAP for BFP Local and NOVA. Requires a public input process and Board approval.
- Could be applied to NRTP, LWCF, BIG – needs more study from policy team particularly for NRTP. Federal funding adds complications for going to biennial funding.
- Already applies to WWRP, ALEA, BFP State, FARR, NOVA E&E
- Should not be implemented for SRFB, FFFPP
- Align the funding cycles with other major funders such as federal agencies, NOAA, US Fisheries, etc.
# Recommended Projects

## Project 3 – Require sufficient sponsor registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description: Modify PRISM to require qualifying information for sponsors at time of applying: UBI #, Sec of State Registration, Tax ID #, articles of incorporation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits: Reduces staff time for working with sponsors missing basic registration status. Would facilitate project evaluation and award. Would also screen out applicants that are ineligible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting findings: Process 3 &amp; 4 - R&amp;C and SRFB Pre-application Process. Applications sometimes are submitted from sponsors that are not adequately organized or registered with the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority/Timeline: Implement in current biennium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated costs/savings: Minimal cost savings. PRISM modification costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation considerations/barriers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Would require PRISM modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Would result in higher confidence in application data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project 4 – Redesign workshops

**Description:** Combine Conservation and SRFB workshops to effect an overall reduction in workshops. Could also combine application and SAWS workshops for all programs. In addition, workshops could be offered on-demand through video on the RCO website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits: Reduce overall workload. Reduce workshop costs. If on-line training is available at the time when applicants need the information, bills submitted might be more complete and require less processing time. More efficient and accessible information for sponsors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives:</strong> None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 3& 4 - R&C and SRFB Pre-application Process – workshops are time consuming to coordinate and deliver in addition to requiring grant managers to travel. Process 10 Interim Reimbursement Process – Processing reimbursement billings is very time consuming because bills are incomplete. Training sessions during the application process cover billing – however the applicant may not actually need to produce a bill for another year.

**Priority/Timeline:** Implement next biennium.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Recurring cost savings of reduced workshops. Incur the cost of developing and maintaining on-line training for topics such as billing. Might reduce the cost of processing invoices if grantees submitted more complete bills.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Section Managers take lead or delegate.
- External contractor may be needed to design combined workshops.
- Does not require legislative or policy change.
- Workshops could be supplemented by web-based tutorials, videos, printed media.
- For Recreation programs, combine SAWS and application workshops.
## Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 5 – Improve policy manual updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Improve communications on policy manual updates. Policy staff would be in charge of all policy manual and timeline updates. Policy manual changes would be tracked on Sharepoint and updated year-round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong> Less confusion among sponsors. Higher quality applications. Less workload for OGMs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting findings:</strong> Process 3 &amp; 4 - R&amp; C and SRFB Pre-application Process. Many sponsors do not receive policy manual updates or the information is not timely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/Timeline:</strong> Start in early 2009 with 2010 completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation considerations/barriers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project will be started by policy staff in January 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would need to test alternative policy update methods and measure effectiveness in retention, application quality. May also need public comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project 6 – Move the planning deadline

**Description:** The deadline for submitting comprehensive plans would be moved to before applications are due.

| Benefits: | Reduce application evaluation workload by eliminating ineligible projects early in the process. |
| Estimated costs/savings: | Eliminate time spent evaluating ineligible projects. Reduce sponsor stress as they know they are eligible. |
| Negatives: | Requires the applicant to produce a comprehensive plan much earlier in the process. |

**Supporting findings:** Process 5 – R&C Application Process. The comprehensive plan is not reviewed for eligibility until step 21 of the process. If the plan is not eligible, all prior steps are wasted effort.

**Priority/Timeline:**

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Implementation overseen by Planning Specialist.
- Applicants may request more extensions.
Recommended Projects

### Project 7 – Increase Submittal Standards for OGM Reviews

**Description:** Increase the requirements to obtain “Submit” status of a proposal. The minimum information required to do a technical review of the project should be required. PRISM edits should be increased to help ensure complete submittals. Grant managers will perform a cursory review of the proposal and terminate the review and send a notice informing the applicant that the proposal is terminated if it does not meet required standards. Applicants could continue with the application process, however the applicant will proceed without the input provided in the initial technical review. The grant manager will only perform the final technical review to verify all technical requirements are met. No comments should be provided to the applicant at this review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Finalizing at submittal eliminates the continuous application amending that occurs. This eliminates the problem of applications being moving targets prior to the review process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negatives:</td>
<td>The applications may not reflect the projects at their best without access to doing amendments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 5 Application Process - Grant managers often spend a great deal of time doing multiple reviews of a project proposal. Applications can achieve submit status in PRISM with very little information placed in a few fields. Many applications are submitted with too little information to even describe the project. Typically up to 1 out of 6 applications are eliminated in the first 2 weeks of the grant cycle because applicant has decided not to pursue the grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated costs/savings:</td>
<td>High return and low cost to implement a new policy, draft a standard letter for applications that do not meet standards, and change PRISM edits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Determining the completeness of reviews and the level of diligence to use is subjective. Cost savings will be realized only of OGMs reduce review time for applications that do not meet submittal standards.
## Project 8 – Improve review panel comment process

**Description:** Implement electronic review panel comment forms that can be simultaneously accessed by all evaluators. Include a blog for evaluators to comment on applications. This would pertain to early review and evaluation for SRFB and only project review for RCFB.

**Benefits:** Reduced paper flow and greater efficiency in writing, tracking and collecting comment forms. Reduce duration of the comment process. This recommendation is scalable to the investment in technology that the RCO is willing to make – from a simple document to a system that retains all project materials that can be securely accessed by all evaluators.

**Negatives:** None

**Supporting findings:** Process 6 & 7 R&C and SRFB Evaluation and Award, Process 4 SRFB Pre-Application and Application Process. Evaluator comment forms are now written on paper and must be routed in paper form. This fosters an inefficient flow of paper documents, sequential processing, numerous handoffs.

**Priority/Timeline:** Notify sponsors in 2009. Implement in 2010.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Reduce the cycle time and duration of the comment process. The technology investment required could be relatively low if a simple shared document for updating commentary was added to PRISM.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Technology needs to provide security and access to participants outside of RCO.
### Project 9 – Improve evaluation response process

**Description:** R&C applicants would submit standardized evaluation responses (including project goals and objectives) similar to the SRFB self-evaluation questionnaire along with their application. There would need to a different questionnaire for each program type to address specific areas of concern. This project is an existing SRFB practice that should be adopted agency-wide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Standardizing application requirements would streamline the application review process resulting in less back and forth with the sponsors and reducing the process cycle time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negatives:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 6 & 7 R&C Evaluation and Award. Many applications are hard to compare and contrast as the elements of the applications can vary, especially the evaluation responses. This will standardize these elements so that reviewers can evaluate more efficiently. This recommendation reflects an adoption of the existing SRFB self-evaluation questionnaire.

**Priority/Timeline:**

**Estimated costs/savings:** Benefits are an easier and potentially better evaluation process for the investment of developing program specific questionnaires.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- This requires applicants to submit an additional form.
Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 10 – Provide more OGM/Review Panel review time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Extend the technical review time period from 10 days to 1 month for SRFB applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong> Higher quality application evaluation. Reduce staff overtime during this condensed period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting findings:</strong> Process 4 Pre Application and Application Process. SRFB currently allows approximately 10 days to conduct the first and final technical review of project applications under the assumption that applications will be 99% complete based on instructions and comments provided throughout the process. In practice they find that upon OGM review, applications have many missing elements, requiring significant effort by the OGM and applicant to finalize the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/Timeline:</strong> May require more study before a decision to implement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation considerations/barriers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ This would require applications to be submitted earlier. This could conflict with sponsor and applicant calendars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 12 – Fast track review for simple projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Implement a fast track review process for simple projects such as Nova and NRTP program projects. This would entail a streamlined application and fewer reviews using fewer players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong> Triage effect of removing simpler applications from the general application process flow freeing up resources for the more complicated projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives:</strong> None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting findings:</strong> Process 5 – R&amp;C Application Process. The existing grant application review process treats all projects the same and applies the same review steps regardless of project complexity. This project recognizes that some projects are simpler in concept and design and can be reviewed and approved with a lower level of effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/Timeline:</strong> Notify sponsors in 2009. Implement in 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated costs/savings:</strong> Reduce workload by limiting review steps for small projects. Reduce duration of small project applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation considerations/barriers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Would need to adjust staff workload to accommodate a different grant cycle/process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Projects

### Project 13 – Eliminate the match certification process

**Description:** The match certification process should be eliminated to reduce delays and staff workload in the R&C Evaluation and Award Process. The agreement document should be reviewed to ensure that the intent of the match certification is included in the agreement, and signing the agreement certifies that matching funds have been secured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits: Eliminating the match certification reduces the process duration time and staff time required to generate, follow-up on receipt and file the certification document.</th>
<th>Negatives: It is possible that the match certification might receive less attention from the sponsors when it is included in the agreement rather than using a separate form.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 6 – R&C Evaluation and Award. The award process is hindered by the need to obtain a match certification. Eliminating this step would compress the process duration time and reduce staff workload.

**Priority/Timeline:** Implement in 2009.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Reduced process duration and cycle time. Eliminate 100-200 certification letters that require emailing, follow-up and filing annually. The cost to implement would be the legal review of the changes to the agreement and communicating the process change to staff.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:** Will require a notification period for sponsors.
### Project 14 – Automate the application scoring process

**Description:** Automate the collection, compilation, and reporting of evaluation scores. The automated system would allow evaluators to input their ratings into a scoring system that can immediately compile and report results, allowing the evaluators to conduct their post evaluation meeting at the same session where the evaluation takes place.

**Benefits:** Reduce process duration and cycle time by eliminating several calculation and review tasks. Immediate compilation and reporting of scores would also allow the evaluators to conduct the post-evaluation meeting in the same session where the evaluation takes place, reducing travel and meeting costs and staff time spent arranging logistics.

**Negatives:** None.

**Supporting findings:** Process 6 – R&C Evaluation and Award. The RCFB application evaluation process relies on paper scoring sheets that are handed off from person to person. The current as-is map shows seven separate handoffs. Additionally, the evaluators must attend the evaluation session and then a second post evaluation meeting that is held 3 or 4 weeks later to discuss scoring issues and finalize the project scoring. This increases meeting costs and the process cycle and duration times, and increases the risk of making errors in the manual scoring calculations.

**Priority/Timeline:**
Implement in 2009 if technology funding is available.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Reduce process duration by 3-4 weeks. Reduced cycle time, risk of error, and meeting and logistical costs. The cost of implementation is technology development or purchasing cost.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Funding needed for the technology solution.
## Project 15 – More flexible agreements

**Description:** Write grant agreements to be more flexible with a standard list of eligible items. Agreements would reference the itemized list of eligible inputs in the Application. Agreements themselves would be less prescriptive regarding specific project inputs. This project should be piloted with maintenance and education projects with the results to be evaluated for potential expansion to other project types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential downstream benefits of simpler billing and amendments.</td>
<td>Less specificity in agreement terms may have unintended consequences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 1 & 2 Overall Grant Process. A significant percentage of project billings are denied or suspended due to invoice terms not matching agreement terms even though the project is substantially in compliance. Many of these denials stem from minor discrepancies that are immaterial as far as the project is concerned. Making agreement terms more outcome oriented may reduce the volume of denied or suspended billings and the associated need for doing amendments.

**Priority/Timeline:**
Implement in 2010 on a pilot basis.

**Estimated costs/savings:** negligible cost savings.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Pilot with maintenance and education projects. Evaluate results for potential expansion.
- In a later implementation phase, agreements would include a certain percentage of overhead and indirect costs.
- For SRFB agreements, milestones would be requested in the application rather than the agreement.
### Project 16 – Streamline agreement approvals

**Description:** Delegate signature authority for agreements to Section Managers. Also, fiscal reviews would be eliminated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Negatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Could reduce the number of process handoffs and the cycle and duration time for completing agreements.</td>
<td>Less oversight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 8 – Agreement process. Currently agreements are approved and signed by both the Section Manager and the Director adding a handoff and increasing the processing time. In addition, agreements are reviewed by a Fiscal manager. This project would curtail the Director review and signature and the fiscal review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority/Timeline:</th>
<th>Estimated costs/savings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement immediately</td>
<td>Negligible cost savings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Director would have access to contracts and be able to review contracts with special conditions as needed.
Recommended Projects

**Project 17 – Reduce timelines for preparing and executing agreements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Description:</strong></th>
<th>Reduce the time allotted for preparing agreements from 90 to 60 days and the time for sponsors to return signed agreements from 90 days to 60 days.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
<td>Could conceivably reduce the agreement process duration time by as much as 60 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negatives:</strong></td>
<td>Some viable projects may need to be cancelled if sponsors are late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting findings:</strong></td>
<td>Process 8 – Agreement Process. The duration time for processing agreements is too long according to stakeholder feedback. The process features two significant processing steps involve preparing the agreements and then awaiting signed agreements from sponsors. This project would reduce the allotted timelines in order to reduce the overall process cycle time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/Timeline:</strong></td>
<td>Implement in 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated costs/savings:</strong></td>
<td>Negligible cost savings. Could reduce reappropriations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Implementation considerations/barriers:** | - Sponsors could have difficulty complying depending on their own approval processes.  
- Need to inform sponsors regarding the policy change.  
- May have to grant time extensions in certain cases.  
- RCO needs to impose consequences. |
Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 18 – Automate the internal agreement and amendment routing process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> PRISM would be modified so that agreements would be routed (within RCO) for approval in electronic form. PRISM would use workflow methods to track the routing of the agreement file to ensure that all parties are on track for review and approval similar to the TVS procedure. PRISM would also be modified to insert the agreement start and billing date and elements for project type automatically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong> Could significantly reduce the paper handoffs of the current process thereby reducing cycle time and the need to handle paper documents. Would boost visibility regarding who is reviewing, status of agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting findings:</strong> Process 8 – Agreement Process. The current agreement process features six handoffs of paper agreement documents prior to sponsor signing. This necessitates a sequential processing model which can be time consuming. Using workflow techniques, process steps could be executed concurrently without the need for handling paper documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/Timeline:</strong> Planned in 2009; Implemented in 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Implementation considerations/barriers:**  
- Development time and cost for implementation. Would entail a contract with PRISM contractors.  
- Would require developing a routing procedure – handled by RCO staff. |
### Recommended Projects

#### Project 18a – Sponsors sign first – agreement routed in PDF

**Description:** Agreements would be transmitted electronically in PDF format to sponsors for their signature before subsequent signing by RCO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentive for sponsors to sign in a timely manner.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 8 – Agreement Process. The current process has RCO signing agreements before sponsors. This reduces the incentive for sponsors to sign the agreements in a timely manner.

**Priority/Timeline:** Implement in 2009

**Estimated costs/savings:** Negligible cost savings.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Minor technical modification to send agreements in PDF format.
- Spam filters may screen out the PDF attachments.
- Need to verify e-mail capabilities of the sponsors.
### Recommended Projects

#### Project 19 – Streamline amendment authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description: Authority for approving amendments would be streamlined. Potential changes suggested by staff include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Cost increases or decreases of less than 20% are approved by Section Managers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Time extensions are approved by OGM and Fiscal based on criteria unless it crosses biennium,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Limit internal amendments to technical corrections and scope changes adding elements and items,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Section Managers approve all amendments unless a higher review is deemed appropriate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ OGM can approve admin and A&amp;E amendments up to program limit (in PRISM); Section Manager approves admin and A&amp;E amendments up to policy manual limit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Deputy or Director approves cost increases or decreases greater than 20%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits: Delegating authority for amendments can reduce process handoffs, cycle and duration time. May increase staff morale.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Negatives: None. |

| Supporting findings: Process 9 – Time Extension Amendment Process. The current process incorporates several review and approval points for amendments even though many amendments are minor in nature. SRFB already has a streamlined process that bypasses Board review. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority/Timeline: May need more study by RCO management prior to implementation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Estimated costs/savings: Negligible cost savings. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation considerations/barriers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Needs review by Agency management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Policy manual changes needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Certain elements may require changes to WAC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommended Projects

### Project 20 – Electronic billing

**Description:** Paper invoices and billing materials would be completely replaced with an electronic billing system that would drastically reduce cycle and duration times of the process. The system will eliminate paper-based process flow and allow the grantees and fiscal to resolve issues more quickly. The technology solution could be enhancements to PRISM or other solutions.

**Benefits:** Could significantly reduce or eliminate the amount of paper billing documents thereby reducing process handoffs and compressing process duration time. It would also reduce the cycle time of communicating with grantees regarding billing issues and changes.

**Negatives:** None.

**Supporting findings:** Process 10 – Interim Reimbursement Process. The current interim billing process features billing documents submitted on paper and handed off between RCO staff in paper form. Using paper documents precludes efficient transfer of billing documents, relies on physical handoffs, increases filing and storage requirements and increases the potential for lost documents. The grantee focus group revealed that RCO customers are very dissatisfied with the duration of the reimbursement process.

**Priority/Timeline:** Implement in 2009-2010 unless a statewide grant management system comes on line sooner.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Reduced workload for Fiscal staff. Offset by costs for either modifying PRISM or implementing a billing software package.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Funding for developing or purchasing software is a barrier in addition to the unknowns associated with the OFM grant management system that is expected to affect RCO in 2 to 3 years.
Recommended Projects

### Project 21 – Improve closeout documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description: Documentation prepared for project closeouts would be enhanced with a more complete and project-specific checklist and inspection report format, and the project closeout letter would be tailored to the project. This would increase consistency and quality of closeout documentation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits: Improving the closeout documentation would facilitate a more thorough and consistent documentation. If properly closed out, project files would be easier to understand when they need to be reviewed for project revisions or public disclosure requests in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives: Additional workload for grants staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting findings: Process 11 – Project Closeout Process. The project closeout process is not documented or standardized. RCO has received audit notes that indicated that closeout documentation was inconsistent and incomplete. Documentation and file maintenance is often overlooked due to more pressing concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated costs/savings: One time cost to prepare checklists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Priority/Timeline:**
- SRFB pilot underway right now. Implement agency-wide once pilot findings are available.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Requiring more thorough closeout procedures would increase OGM workloads.
Recommended Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project 22 – Strategically plan travel and increase desk audits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong> Assess R&amp;C project risk to strategically plan grant manager site visit plans and promote desk audits of low risk projects. Encourage desk audits to closeout low risk projects or those that are too difficult to visit. For higher risk projects determine when site visits would be most beneficial to mitigate project risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong> Reduce costs of travel and final inspections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting findings:</strong> Process 11 – Project Close out. Desk audits are much more cost effective than site visits of projects completed throughout the state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority/Timeline:</strong> This practice already occurs for SRFB projects but there needs to be a written policy to guide consistent application. May require additional study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation considerations/barriers:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduced grant manager time in the field could reduce the effectiveness of the relationships they have built with grantees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Projects that receive Federal funds require a site visit during project closeout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SRFB currently visits all projects at closeout because they believe it is necessary to thoroughly analyze the effectiveness of the project. This recommendation only applies to RCFB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommended Projects

#### Project 23 – Implement self-compliance certification

| Description: | RCFB Project sponsors would self-certify that their projects are in compliance with the agreed terms. Compliance would then be verified through spot checks, aerial photos. Illegal conversions or other non-compliance would be sanctioned by restricting further funding. |
| Benefits: | This would allow RCFB staff to attain a certain level of assurance regarding compliance without the need to physically inspect every project. |
| Negatives: | Some sponsors may cheat. |
| Supporting findings: | Process 12 – Compliance Inspection. Projects are subject to inspection to ensure that they are in compliance with project terms. RCO staff are not able to inspect all projects diminishing the level of assurance that projects are built to the agreed terms. |
| Priority/Timeline: | Low priority for implementation. |
| Estimated costs/savings: | Currently RCO is only attempting to inspect projects that require inspections. |

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- There are more urgent issues that need to be addressed.
- Recommendation only applies to R&C. SRFB want to inspect projects periodically after close to learn about the long-term results of projects. This knowledge would help create more effective projects in the future.
Recommended Projects

### Project 24 – Regularly notify sponsors about grantee responsibilities

**Description:** Send annual notification to RCFB project sponsors to remind sponsors of their ongoing responsibilities that relate to projects that were funded by grants through RCO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Negatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of revisions that occur in closed projects because the sponsor was unaware of their responsibilities.</td>
<td>Additional cost and effort involved of notifying sponsors annually.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Grant managers say that revisions to closed projects are very time consuming and come up unexpectedly. Oftentimes sponsors do not know about their responsibilities for grant funding received in the past. If they did know about these responsibilities we assume that some revisions could be avoided or at least addressed in a less urgent fashion than they are now.

**Priority/Timeline:** Low priority for implementation.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Reduced OGM workload due to fewer project revisions.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- There are more urgent issues that need to be addressed.
- The impact on revision workload is just an assumption. The correlation between revisions and knowledge of grantee responsibilities is not known at this time.
## Separate Consultant Recommendations

### Project C1 – Increase standards for qualifying sponsors/applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Increase qualifying standards for sponsors and applicants.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits:</td>
<td>Better quality applications that would require fewer amendments. Reduced application workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatives:</td>
<td>May unfairly restrict qualified projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting findings:</td>
<td>The existing grant application workload can be overwhelming and result in lack of attention to otherwise qualified projects. This change would reduce the application flow at the front end by weeding out unqualified applicants early in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team voting:</td>
<td>Implement now – 5 Needs more study – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated costs/savings:</td>
<td>Significant staff time savings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation considerations/barriers:</td>
<td>Need to establish qualifying standards and other criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project C2 – Modify billing policies

**Description:** Perform a detailed audit on the first and last invoices submitted by sponsors. Perform spot checks on interim billings. Retain 5-10% retention and deduct questionable billing amounts from the last invoice.

**Benefits:** Would free up OGM time for project management.

**Negatives:** RCO may end up approving many faulty interim billings. Would have to rely on good auditing procedures to determine appropriate billed amounts at the end of the project.

**Supporting findings:** Current procedures call for every sponsor billing to be examined for compliance with agreement terms. This results in significant staff time spent on processing and examining billings.

**Team voting:** No voting conducted for this project.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Significant staff time savings.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Need to establish good audit procedures as the integrity of the billings and the sponsor’s finances comes down to one final invoice.
## Separate Consultant Recommendations

### Project C3 – Applicants request R&C reviews before final submittal

**Description:** Currently R&C OGMs review applications at least once individually and then again in the project review meeting and a final time during the project evaluation process. This recommendation is to make it optional for applicants to request OGM reviews and project review meetings within parameters and timeframes set by RCO. The goal is to review only complete applications from applicants that want to receive input.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Negatives:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate wasting OGM and project review team time on applications that are not ready for review.</td>
<td>Some applicants might not know they need help and submit substandard applications for very good projects. When projects are reviewed for movement to “complete” status, there could be many missing components to the application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supporting findings:** Process 8 R&C Application Process. OGMs reported that many applications (100-200 immediately drop out) have minimal information available for the 1st OGM review, and some are still incomplete at the project review meeting after OGM input is received. Applicants seem to know they are given many chances to improve the application and fail to meet interim deadlines. Interim reviews are then less productive than if materials where complete and the applicant really wanted to get RCO input to prepare a successful grant application.

**Priority/Timeline:**
Low priority since this requires significant cultural change for R&C and applicants.

**Estimated costs/savings:** Undetermined. We do not know the exact percentage of applications that are not ready at specified OGM and project review meeting times.

**Implementation considerations/barriers:**
- Asking applicants to drive the review process is contrary to the current culture at R&C.
- If the review at final evaluation is not thorough enough it is possible that projects that have not been thoroughly planned would be funded and problems could arise during the implementation process.
Appendix A - Focus group input

This is a summary of the comments recorded at the October 8 sponsor focus group. The comments reflect the perceptions and sentiments of the participants and have been edited by the consultants strictly for brevity. No attempt has been made to determine the veracity of these comments and no inferences should be made regarding their accuracy.

- Overall comments:
  - Overall really like working with RCO and the staff.
  - Built up trust over the years.
  - Very pleased that RCO is asking for their input.
  - Application process takes too long.
  - Reimbursements take too long.
  - PRISM is a better system than other paper-based processes.
  - Other grant-making organizations do not require presentations which is preferable. Some will make an informal site visit.

- Application process:
  - Takes too long. Big delay to get your money. Often this delay can immediately put the project off schedule because we might miss a window of opportunity to get started. There are seasonal concerns.
  - The process takes a whole year. We really are starting preparing the next applications for the following year before the prior year’s application cycle is completed.
  - The timing of due dates in the summer is bad. It is our busy time of year and the people that prepare the applications need to be out in the field.
  - What really matters is the presentation. Those that don’t have the skill and resources are at a disadvantage.
  - There was a new requirement for the applicant to create maps. This does not seem fair since not all applicants have the capabilities and resources. RCO should continue to do this.
  - The presentation is a big burden on the applicant – especially if they are from eastern WA.
  - Some other grantors ask a standard set of questions and have an informal chat at the site. No presentation.
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- Application process (continued):
  - It costs about $10,000 to prepare an application. It would be good if we could be told early in the process if they think our project will get funded. Like telling us what the board’s priorities are etc.
  - Lead entities feel that RCO repeats some of the vetting and prioritization that the lead entity already does. “They should trust us more.” RCO Grant managers should come to more of our board meetings and stay for the entire time – rather than just leaving after we are done discussing their project. They need to know more about our business.

- Evaluating applications:
  - Fair and transparent. Satisfied with the process

- Grant Awards:
  - Takes too long.
  - Lead entities know how much they will be getting and don't understand why there is such a long time between when the evaluation is done and the projects finally can start up. What is happening in this time period?

- Contracting:
  - No real comments here. Seems fine.

- Amending Contracts:
  - Takes too long.
  - Sometimes amendments happen because there is the long delay in the beginning of the project when we finally can get started – so the project is immediately behind.
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- **Reimbursements:**
  - Takes WAY too long. It can take 6 months to get paid.
  - Paperwork is confusing and difficult.
  - One person had a big issue with the matching funds requirements. Something about getting property at below market rates and potentially not being able to come up with all the matching. They said that the deal they worked out was in the best interest of RCO but it didn’t fit the rules necessarily. Also, administrative costs should be reimbursed in full rather than having matching requirements.

- **Inspections:**
  - No comment. Process is fine.

- **PRISM:**
  - PRISM is better than other grant processes that are all on paper.
  - Really like being able to access the PRISM repository and use it as their own electronic project files.
  - The PRISM upgrade has lost some functionality we had before. I think this had to do with reporting and seeing things all on one screen. Too many screens were an issue – but not sure if this was related to the upgrade.
  - Can’t easily look at our own projects on the screen. I believe you need to run a report to get this info.
  - No real complaints on processing speed.
  - Data is accurate.
  - Much preferred to paper-based processes.

- **Improvements:**
  - Multiple screen issue.
  - Look at only my projects.
  - People that do not have a log-in cannot view the data. It would be nice if others had a read-only access.
  - Better on-screen sorting of information.
Appendix B – To-be (Proposed) Process Maps

Key to symbols

1. These boxes represent tasks or process steps.
2. These boxes represent tasks or process steps.
3. These boxes represent tasks or process steps.
4. Yellow boxes show new, proposed process steps.

- **Solid lines** show the process path from one task to the next.
- **Connector to/from another page**
- **Decision point**
- **Process start or end point**

These page-wide rows represent organizational units or staff types. They show how process steps alternate between units and staff. They are called “swim lanes.”
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Recreation and Conservation Office
1B - Nova NRTP Grant Process – To Be Project 12 – Fast track review for simple projects

Page 1

1. Submit application
2. Review application, prepare comments about deficiencies
3. Make required changes
4. Prepare review panel materials
5. Conduct written evaluation

Go to step 15 of process 6 – R&C Evaluation and Award
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3 – TO-BE R&C Pre Application Process – Proposed Project 6

Start

1. Prior fall, planner sends out plan eligibility lapse letter
2. Policy team prepares materials for board meeting
3. Adopt grant process, eligibility criteria and evaluation process
3a. Post schedule
4. Planner recruits volunteers for review and evaluation
5. Planner and section manager create schedule for grant cycle, enter in PRISM
6. Planner and section manager prepare grant application and manuals
7. Review application manual, refine as necessary
8. Modify website IT and communications
9. Database Admin modifies PRISM to accommodate process
10. Communications Notify interested parties, invite to workshops
11. Hold grant workshops
12. Requests user name and logon to use PRISM
13. IT assigns user name and password

PRISM not always available this early, pre-applications are optional

Via website, postcards, email press releases

Applicant

IT

Grant Staff

RCO Other

Section Manager & Planner

Board & Evaluation Team

Recreation and Conservation Office

Final Report to the Recreation & Conservation Office
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 – TO-BE R&amp;C Pre Application Process – Proposed Project 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Staff</th>
<th>Section Manager &amp; Planner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>21 Review comp plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>22 Accept plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO Other</td>
<td>23 Applicant is ineligible to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>14 Prepare pre application in PRISM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>19 Submit comprehensive plan by planning deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board &amp; Evaluation Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B – To-be (Proposed) Process Maps

4 - SRFB Pre Application & Application Process – To Be Project 8 – Improve Comment Process

- Board provides policy direction to the SRFB staff
- SRFB staff presents manual & policy changes to LEAG & COR; Take feedback
- Use Sharepoint for drafting manual
- Draft manual
- Final policy
- Adopt final policy
- PRISM: Database Admin. modifies PRISM to accommodate process
- A
- B
- C
- D
- E
- F
- G
- H
- I
- J
- K
- L
- M
- N
- O
- P
- Q
- R
- S
- T
- U
- V
- W
- X
- Y
- Z

Draft manual

Prepare draft manual for LEAG & COR

Develop manuals & grant timeline for board approval

Prepare contracts to assemble review panel

Conduct quarterly meeting/ training session for review panel

Final report to the Recreation & Conservation Office
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4 - SRFB Pre Application & Application Process – To Be Project 8 – Improve Comment Process

- 13. Hold grant workshops
- 14. Requests user name and login to use PRISM
- 15. IT assigns user name and password
- 16. Submit request to schedule a review panel visit
- 16.5. Prepare pre-app materials
- 17. Lead entity staff input pre-app materials into PRISM
- 18. Burns a CD w/ pre-app project info; Send to review panel members
- 19. Conduct site visits
- 20. Conduct quarterly review panel meetings
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4 - SRFB Pre Application & Application Process – To Be Project 8 – Improve Comment Process

1. Grant Manager
   - 22. Review and enter comments
   - Early app comment forms

2. Applicant
   - 24. Review early comment forms & adjust and finalize applications
   - Early app comment forms
   - SIMULTANEOUS INPUT AND REVIEW OF COMMENTS

3. Regional/Lead Entities
   - 23. Review comments
   - Early app comment forms
   - Rank projects; Submit ranked project list w/ applications
   - Project list
   - Applications

4. Board & Review Panel
   - 21. Prepares shared early comment form
   - Early app comment forms

5. Section Manager

6. RCO Other

7. PRISM
   - 26. Review applications; Move to complete status in PRISM
   - End
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**Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office**

**5 – R&C Application Process – To Be**

**Project 7 – Increase Submittal Standards for OGM Reviews**

**Page - 1**

**Applicant**

1. **Start**
   - Input application data and attachments into PRISM. Select Application Submit button.
   - PRISM

2. **PRISM accept submittal?**
   - Yes
   - Input application data and attachments into PRISM. Select Application Submit button.
   - PRISM
   - No

3. **Resolve issues, call OGM, IT, support for assistance if necessary**
   - PRISM

4. **Admin, assign project manager, assign fiscal year, set up a file**
   - Admin

5. **Distribute project file to OGM**
   - Project file

6. **Resolve issues, call OGM, IT, support for assistance if necessary**
   - PRISM

7. **Admin, assign project manager, assign fiscal year, set up a file**
   - Admin

8. **Distribute project file to OGM**
   - Project file

9. **Conduct cursory review**
   - PRISM

9a. **Terminate review send did not meet standards letter**
   - PRISM

9b. **Conduct detailed review, Map the project, complete checklist**
   - PRISM

10. **Assist in mailing checklist and materials as requested**
    - Checklist materials

11. **Print list of applications. Verify applicant has planning eligibility, update PRISM**
    - Application list

---

**Other RCO**

- PRISM

**Grants Staff**

- PRISM

**Resource Planner**

- PRISM
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

5 – R&CO Application Process – To Be Project 7 – Increase Submittal Standards for OGM Reviews

1. **Applicant**
   - 17. Update application data with new information.
   - 18. Meet with OGM for project review meeting

2. **Other RCO**
   - 16. Support staff and section managers plan and prepare for project review meeting
   - 19. Section Manager & possibly Board Advisory Comm. Participate in project review

3. **Grants Staff**
   - 14. Contact applicant. Visit applicant as needed
   - 15. Prepare technical review materials
   - 18. Participate in project review meeting

4. **Resource Planner**
   - 12. Send letters & information to organizations
   - 13. Plan and prepare for project review meeting, plan logistics
   - 20. Update application data with new information

Form of project review determined by policy, can be written or in person. June and July spent doing project reviews

Site visits happen any time. Letter intent or after application submit most typical.

Significant task
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

R&C Application Process – To Be Project 7 – Increase Submittal Standards for OGM Reviews

Applicant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Review application for completeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Finalize data. Move project to Application Complete status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Change status to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sign letter. Mail &amp; file a copy in the project file.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other RCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Application checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grants Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Project in application complete status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource Planner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finalize data. Move project to Application Complete status.
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Recreation and Conservation Office
6 – TO-BE R&C Evaluation & Award – Proposed Projects 8, 13 and 14
Page 1 - Evaluation

- Start
  - Resource planner
  - Complete Evaluation Schedule; Notify applicants
  - Fiscal staff
  - Applicants
  - Evaluators
  - Approved?
  - Score sheets
  - Yes
  - No
  - Print & provide to evaluators Project Summaries, Cost Estimates & other documents. (Admin staff)
  - Prepare score sheets in selected software
  - Provide live presentation. (Attended by Section & Grant managers)
  - Submit Powerpoint materials to PRISM
  - Size limitations on submission (<50 meg)
  - Score each question for each project
  - Fiscal preparation of score sheet has been eliminated
  - Res Planner & Section Manager work on questions.

PRISM consistent w/ policy manual?

Yes

No

No

Yes

A
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Recreation and Conservation Office

6 – TO-BE R&C Evaluation & Award – Proposed Projects 8, 13 and 14

Page – 2 - Evaluation

12 Reviews & approves scores and reports

Steps 13-16 eliminated with electronic scoring

17 Conduct post-evaluation meeting w/ evaluators; discuss issues.

18 Release scores in PRISM; Notify Section/Resource Managers re: scores released

19 Prepare evaluation results for the Web; Notify results to applicants re: rankings

20 Post rankings on the website

End
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**Recreation and Conservation Office**

6 – TO-BE R&C Evaluation & Award – Proposed Projects 8, 13 and 14

Page – 3 - Award

- **Resource Planner**
  - **Start**
  - Download ranking data from PRISM into Excel to create Board Reports
  - **PRISM**
  - **Excel**

- **Applicant**
  - **OGM**
  - **Download ranking data from PRISM into Excel to create Board Reports**

- **OGM**
  - **Download ranking data from PRISM into Excel to create Board Reports**

- **Communications**
  - **Match certification process is eliminated**
  - **Post Approved Board ranking list. Issue press release (Communications Officer)**

- **Fiscal staff**
  - **Board Reports**
  - **Conduct RCFB Board Meeting; Approves Ranking List**
  - **Forward Report to OFM for approval by Governor & Legislature**
  - **Approve list of projects for funding**
  - **Move projects to Board Funded, Board Not Funded or Board Alternate status. Allocate funding pursuant to Board direction. Conduct successful applicant workshop – cover billing**

- **Board**
  - **End**
  - **PRISM**
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Recruitment and Conservation Office

1. Start
2. Prepare application materials for technical review; Burn DVD of materials for Review Panel
3. Conduct project review; Complete post-app shared project comment form
4a. Simultaneous review and post comments
4b. Simultaneous review and post comments
4c. Simultaneous review and post comments
5. Post-app project comment form
6. Draft grant report
7. Final draft report
8. Prepare draft Grant Report for public review
9. End
10. Finalize Grant Report
11. Make funding decisions
12. Move projects to Board-funded status in PRISM

SIMULTANEOUS INPUT AND REVIEW OF COMMENTS
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

8 – TO-BE Agreement Process – Proposed Projects 16, 17, 18 and 18a

Page - 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>SRFB only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Staff</td>
<td>Solicit milestones in application. Will expedite agreement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>SRFB only. RCFB asks for many more materials. Up to grant manager whether materials are emailed or mailed and if support staff assists in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For funded projects establish Agreement Checklist. Note complete / incomplete items. Verify correct contact person.

2 - Print and mail Milestone Letter, Milestone Worksheet & Agreement Checklist

3 - Prepare materials

5 - Contact client regarding checklist items required

This loop cycles several times. Only 1% cancel. SRFB does no cancellations.

60 days from Step 2 to Off-page connector B. Reduced from 90 days.
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8 – TO-BE Agreement Process – Proposed Projects 16, 17, 18 and 18a

Page - 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - Prepare cancellation letter, call sponsor and tell them letter is coming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Sign letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Mail letter, file copy of letter in chrono file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Change status to dead status &amp; release funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If checklist materials never returned SRFB never cancels gives more time

Getting rid of project file
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

8 – TO-BE Agreement Process – Proposed Projects 16, 17, 18 and 18a

- Sponsor
  - Establish milestones & special conditions. Complete the agreement checklist & mark completed.
  - Some grant managers require support staff assistance

- Grant Staff
  - Route agreement for review. Verify legal description & special conditions. Prepare for signature.
  - PRISM will allow materials to pass edits even if all fields are not complete and/or correct. The agreement can go through process and goes signing and comes to Fiscal and cannot apply it until data is complete

- Support Staff
  - PRISM
  - PRISM

- Section Manager/Director
  - Project passes PRISM edits?
    - Yes
    - No
      - Staff completes needed data.
      - PRISM
  - Section Manager approves?
    - Yes
    - D
      - Director review and approval eliminated

- Fiscal Staff
  - Fiscal review is eliminated

Some grant managers require support staff assistance.
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

8 – TO-BE Agreement Process – Proposed Projects 16, 17, 18 and 18a

Sponsor

- Enter mail date in PRISM
- PDF file of agreement

Grant Staff

- 60 days to complete steps 21-23. Reduced from 90 days.
- E-mail PDF file of agreement to sponsors; file copy of cover letter in Chrono and project file
- Sponsor returns signed contract within 90 days?

Support Staff

- 22 - Receive agreement, sign and return
- 23 - When sponsors don’t sign (rare), project is terminated
- PDF file of agreement

Section Manager Direct

- 25 - Call or email and remind sponsor until received
- Yes
- No

Fiscal Staff

- 26 - PRISM
- Yes
- No

27 - Contact sponsor for clarification. Recommend action.

- Yes
- Minor changes?

- No
- G

- F

29 - Initial contract changes or ask grant manager to prepare a new contract

- Yes

- No

57
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

8 – TO-BE Agreement Process – Proposed Projects 16, 17, 18 and 18a

Page - 5

Sponsor

Grant Staff

Support Staff

Section Manager Director

Fiscal Staff

PRISM

Agreement

30 - Enter sponsor signature date. Project moves to Active Status. Initial agreement.

20 - Sign letter and agreement

31 - Scan and file agreement; Enter sponsor and MA signature dates in PRISM; Send copy to sponsor.

Project file

End

PRISM

Agreement

PRISM has strict edits and contact appropriate parties until info is correct. Happens frequently VERY time consuming. Fiscal, OGM, Sponsor, System admin. Can be a technical error in PRISM and needs to do a technical override.
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9 – TO BE - Time Extension Amendment Process – Proposed project 19

**Grant Staff**

1. **Monthly Status Reports**
   - Print & distribute Monthly Status Reports

2. **Amendment request**
   -Receive and evaluate written amendment request from a sponsor

3. **PRISM**
   -Write up the amendment and recommendation, route to section manager

4. **Section Manager / Deputy Director / Board**
   -Discuss time extension with Grant Manager; Renegotiate w/ sponsor

5. **Amendment request**
   -Yes
     -Yes
     -No
     -No

6. **Section Manager signs amendment and route to support staff**

7. **Director of Board approval needed?**
   -Yes
   -No

8. **Apply amendment to agreement in PRISM**

**Grant/Support Staff**

1. **Print & distribute Monthly Status Reports**

2. **PRISM**
   -Generates an e-mail re: 90 days prior to grant end date

3. **Amendment request**
   -Determine an amendment is needed call Grant manager to negotiate terms

4. **Amendment request**
   -Yes
   -No

5. **Director or Board approval needed?**
   -Yes
   -No

**Sponsor**

1. **PRISM generates an e-mail re: 90 days prior to grant end date**

2. **Amendment request**
   -Determine an amendment is needed call Grant manager to negotiate terms

3. **Amendment request**
   -Yes
   -No

4. **End**

**Fiscal Staff**

1. **PRISM**
   -Mail amendment to sponsor, file copies in chrono and project files
Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps

Recreation and Conservation Office

1 - Overall R&C Grant Process

1. Start
   - Adopt grant process, eligibility criteria and evaluation process

2. Database Adm. modifies PRISM to accommodate process
3. Modify website IT and communications
4. Prepare grant application and manuals, planner and section manager
5. Review application manual, refine as necessary
6. Communications: Notify interested parties, invite to workshops
7. Conduct site visits and provide technical assistance as necessary
8. Hold grant workshops
9. Begin application with RCO assistance
10. Admin. create project files and distribute OGM

Via website, postcards, email press releases

Materials

Happens throughout process as necessary PRISM may not up and ready until workshops

Section & Manager Planning

Admin. staff & fiscal

Grant manager

Board & evaluation team

Applicant
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Recreation and Conservation Office

1 - Overall R&C Grant Process

Section Managers present results and funding recommendations to the Board

Communications sends emails/telephone approved project lists, notify media

Section Managers tabulate score and rank applications

Grant manager

Application intake, review for completeness, work with app. To finalize application

Prepare applications for evaluation

Evaluate applications

Board adopts project list, gains Governor and Legislative approval

Applicant

Work with RCO to complete application

Offer technical review workshops

Application

PRISM

Funding or prefunding meeting depending on program. May be two meetings.

PRISM

21 Sign agreement

20 Issue agreements

Issue agreements

Agreements

Section Managers

Tabulate score and rank applications

14

16

19

18

17

16

15

14

13

12

11

10

9

8

7

6

5

4

3

2

1

11

13

14

15

18

19

21

20

16

17

19

20

20

20

20

20
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Recreation and Conservation Office

1 – Overall R&C Grant Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCO/other</th>
<th>Section Manager &amp; Planner</th>
<th>Board &amp; evaluation team</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fiscal analyze and prepare invoice for payment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>React to project issues, review/ approve reimbursements, amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reactive rather than proactive management</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Perform site visits as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Complete projects and invoice for reimbursements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Invoices</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Provide final report and request project close out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Amendments</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Perform final inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Close out project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Post completion inspections</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Post completion agreement issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Respond to post completion agreement issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Communications or section managers prepare annual/ biennial reports to Governor, Legislature &amp; Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Communications or section managers prepare annual/ biennial reports to Governor, Legislature &amp; Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual/ biennial reports

If these come up – this could be significant and involve reopening the project. 80-100% chance the agreement will need to be renegotiated
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Recruitment and Conservation Office

2 - Overall SRFB Grant Process

Page 1

1. Adopt grant process, eligibility criteria and evaluation process

2. Database Admin. modifies PRISM to accommodate process

3. Modify website IT and communications

4. Prepare grant application and application, planer and section manager

5. Review application manual, refine as necessary

6. Communications Notify interested parties, invite to workshops

7. Hold grand workshops

8. Begin application with RCO assistance

9. Conduct site visits and provide technical assistance as necessary

10. Conduct review panel meetings

11. Admin. create project files and distribute OGM

PRISM

via website, postcards, email

Project files

Press releases

Application materials

Application materials

Start

Happens throughout process as necessary PRISM may not be up and ready until workshops
**Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps**

**Recreation and Conservation Office**

**2 - Overall SRFB Grant Process**

**Section Manager**

- Applications
  - Projects list
  - Rank & score projects; Submit ranked list with applications to RCO
  - Application intake, review for completeness, work with app. To finalize application

**Grant manager**

- Applications
  - Prepare applications for evaluation
  - Evaluate applications
  - Conduct regional presentations; Modify applications

**Lead Entity**

- Applications
  - PRISM
  - Rank & score projects; Submit ranked list with applications to RCO
  - Prepare final report with funding recommendations
  - Final grant report

**Board & Review Panel**

- Applications
  - PRISM
  - Evaluate applications
  - Board funds projects
  - Final grant report

**Applicant**

- Applications
  - PRISM
  - Work with RCO to complete application
  - Funding or prefunding meeting depending on program. May be two meetings.

**Final grant report**

- Communications: emails/telephone approved project lists, notify media

- Issue agreements

- Sign agreement

- Public comment period
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Recreation and Conservation Office

2 - Overall SRFB Grant Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page - 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RCO Admin &amp; Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board &amp; Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Fiscal analyze and prepare invoice for payment

25 React to project issues, review/approve reimbursements, amendments

26 Perform site visits as needed

27 Provide final documents and request project close out

28 Perform final inspection

29 Close out project

30 Post-completion inspections

31 Respond to post completion agreement issues

32 Communications or section managers prepare annual/biennial reports to Governor, Legislature & Congress

33 Communications or section managers prepare annual/biennial reports to Governor, Legislature & Congress

Annual/ biennial reports

PRISM

Could the sponsors self-certify compliance? Sanctions for non-compliance.

If these come up – this could be significant and involve reopening the project. 80-100% chance the agreement will need to be renegotiated

Invoices

Reactive rather than proactive management

Acquisition projects do not always require a site visit. Sometimes final report or photos as proof of completion.

End
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Recreation and Conservation Office
3 - R&C Pre Application Process

1. Prior fall, planner sends out plan eligibility lapse letter
2. Policy team prepares materials for board meeting
3. Planner recruits volunteers for review and evaluation
4. Planner and section manager create schedule for grant cycle, enter in PRISM
5. Planner and section manager prepare grant application and manuals
6. Review application manual, refine as necessary
7. Database Admin. modifies PRISM to accommodate process
8. Modify website IT and communications
9. Communications Notify interested parties, invite to workshops
10. Hold grant workshops
11. Requests user name and logon to use PRISM
12. IT assigns user name and password

PRISM not always available this early, pre-applications are optional

Via website, postcards, email press releases

Adopt grant process, eligibility criteria and evaluation process

PRISM

Schedule

3a Post schedule

Final Report to the Recreation & Conservation Office

Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps
Recreation and Conservation Office
3 - R&C Pre Application Process

Page - 2

Applicant

End

Prepare pre application in PRISM

PRISM
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Recreation and Conservation Office

4 - SRFB Pre Application & Application Process

Start

1. Board provides policy direction to the SRFB staff

2. Prepare draft manual for LEAG & COR

3. SRFB staff presents manual & policy changes to LEAG & COR; Take feedback

Draft manual

4. Develop manuals & grant timeline for board approval

5. Adopt final policy

Final manual

6. Prepare contracts to assemble review panel

Contracts

7. Conduct quarterly meeting/training session for review panel

8. Modify website IT and communications

9. Database Admin. modifies PRISM to accommodate process

PRISM

A

Use Sharepoint for drafting manual
Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps

Recreation and Conservation Office

4 - SRFB Pre Application & Application Process

Page 3

21 Prepares early application project comment forms on each project

22 Review and edit early application project comment forms; Submit to lead entities

Early app comment forms

23 Route comment forms to applicants

Early app comment forms

24 Review early comment forms & adjust and finalize applications

Early app comment forms

25 Rank projects; Submit ranked project list w/ applications

Early app comment forms

Project list

Applications

26 Review applications; Move to complete status in PRISM

PRISM

End

This document should be prepared in PRISM
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office
5 – R&C Application Process

**Applicant**
1. Input application data and attachments into PRISM. Select Application Submit button
   - Yes
   - No

2. PRISM accept submission?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Query to find applications in pre application
   - Yes
   - No

4. Is it a viable application?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Move to wastebasket
6. Work with applicant as necessary to achieve submit

6. Resolve issues, call OGM, IT, support for assistance if necessary

7. Admin, assign project manager, assign fiscal year, set up a file
8. Distribute project file to OGM

9. Conduct detailed review, map the project, complete checklist

10. Assist in mailing checklist and materials as requested

**Other RCO**

**Grants Staff**

**Resource Planner**

**Final Report to the Recreation & Conservation Office**
Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps

Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office
5 – R&C Application Process
Page - 3

Applicant:

24 Review application for completeness

Other RCO:

25 Project in application complete status?

Yes

No

26 Finalize data. Move project to Application Complete status.

Grants Staff:

27 Change status to complete

Application checklist

PRISM

PRISM

28 Sign letter. Mail & file a copy in the project file.

Final review letter

End
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Recreation and Conservation Office

6. R&C Evaluation & Award

Start

1. Finalize evaluation team
   - PRISM

2. Complete Evaluation Schedule; Notify applicants
   - PRISM

3. Verify & update evaluation question, min/max points, & multiplier.
   - Print Evaluation Question Report.

4. Update PRISM
   - PRISM

5. Prepare score sheets in Excel using PRISM data
   - Score sheets

6. Refine score sheets
   - Score sheets

7. Print & provide to evaluators
   - Project Summaries, Cost Estimates & other documents. (Admin staff)

8. Submit Powerpoint materials to PRISM
   - Size limitations on submission (<50 meg)
   - PRISM

   (Attended by Section & Grant managers)

10. Score each question for each project. Return score sheets to RCO
   - Score sheets

Approved?

Res Planner & Section Manager work on questions.


Yes

No

Yes

No

A
Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps

11. Score staff questions
12. Reviews & approves scores
13. Review and approve Staff scores. Return to project managers if adjustments are needed.
15. Verify scores
14. Enter staff & team scores into PRISM. Print raw score sheets.
16. Print & make PDFs of Evaluation reports. Check calculations. Deliver reports to Section Manager.
17. Conduct post-evaluation meeting w/ evaluators; Discuss issues.
19. Prepare evaluation results for the Web. Notify results to applicants re: rankings
20. Post rankings on the website

End
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**Recreation and Conservation Office**

**SRFB Evaluation & Award Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Section Manager &amp; Grants staff</th>
<th>Review Panel</th>
<th>Lead entities &amp; Regions</th>
<th>Fiscal staff</th>
<th>SRFB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prepare application materials for technical review; Burn DVD of materials for Review Panel</td>
<td>2. Conduct project review; Complete post-app project comment form</td>
<td>3. Proof &amp; edit post-app project comment forms; Submit to lead entities</td>
<td>4. Review forms and send to applicants</td>
<td>5. Prepare response for POC projects for Regional presentation</td>
<td>6. Finalize the post-application project comment form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Projects of concern identified (POC)
- Draft grant report
- Final grant report
- Post-app project comment form
- Post-app project comment form
- Response letter
- Final grant report
- Draft grant report
- PRISM
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8 - Agreement Process

Page - 1

**Sponsor**
- SRFB only
  - For funded projects establish Agreement Checklist. Note complete / incomplete items. Verify correct contact person.

**Grant Staff**
- PRISM
  - Solicit milestones in application. Will expedite agreement process.

**Support Staff**
- SRFB only: RCFB asks for many more materials. Up to grant manager whether materials are emailed or mailed and if support staff assists in the process.

**Fiscal Staff**
- PRISM
  - Prepare materials

**Section Manager Director**

**Director**

**Solicit milestones in application. Will expedite agreement process.**

**3 Prepare materials**

**RCFB asks for many more materials**

**This loop cycles several times. Only 1% cancel. SRFB does no cancellations.**

**All checklist items returned?**
- Yes
  - Terminate project?
- No

**5 Contact client regarding checklist items required**

**90 days from Step 2 to Off-page connector B**

**Yes**

**No**

**End**
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

8 - Agreement Process

If checklist materials never returned SRFB never cancels gives more time

7 - Prepare cancellation letter, call sponsor and tell them letter is coming

Grant Staff

Cancellation letter

Getting rid of project file

Support Staff

Mail letter, file copy of letter in chrono file.

Fiscal Staff

Chrono and project file

Cancellation letter

Section Manager Director

8 - Sign letter

Cancellation letter

End

PRISM

Cancellation letter

Change status to dead status & release funds.
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

8 - Agreement Process

11 Establish milestones & special conditions. Complete the agreement checklist & mark completed.

12 - Print agreement & materials. Verify legal description & special conditions. Prepare for signatures.

Project passes PRISM edits? Yes

PRISM will allow materials to pass edits even if all fields are not complete and/or correct. The agreement can go through process and go signing and comes to Fiscal and cannot apply it until data is complete.

Yes

14 Staff completes needed data.

16 Make required revisions and actions

19 Make required revisions and actions

PRISM

G

B

agreement

agreement

agreement

agreement

Director approves?

Yes

Section Manager approves?

Yes

No

No

No

Could eliminate step 17 per Mark

Multiple sequential reviews of the agreement based on paper document transfer. Use workflow to facilitate concurrent reviews based on pdf doc.

Automate batch edit process to catch for missing info. Need to inform all grant managers re: the proper procedure.

Some grant managers require support staff assistance

Page 3 - 8

10

13

15
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Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office

8 - Agreement Process

Page - 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Grant Staff</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
<th>Section Manager Director</th>
<th>Fiscal Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter M.A. signature date in PRISM</td>
<td>Sign letter and agreement</td>
<td>Mail 2 copies &amp; file copy of cover letter in Chrono and project file.</td>
<td>Sponsors return signed contract within 90 days?</td>
<td>Changes were made to the contract (fiscal checks)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive agreement, sign and return</td>
<td>Mail 2 copies &amp; file copy of cover letter in Chrono and project file.</td>
<td>Sponsor returns signed contract within 90 days?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90 days to complete steps 21-23

When sponsors don’t sign (rare), project is terminated

25 Call or email and remind sponsor until received

Yes

27 - Contact sponsor for clarification. Recommend action.

No

Minor changes?

G

F

D
Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps

83 - Agreement Process

Page: 5

Sponsor

Grant Staff

Support Staff

Section Manager

Director

Fiscal Staff

PRISM

Agreement

30 - Enter sponsor signature date. Project moves to Active Status. Initial agreement.

31 - Scan and file agreement

Project file

Agreement

End

Modify M.A. date if different from step 21

PRISM has strict edits and contact appropriate parties until info is correct. Happens frequently. VERY time consuming. Fiscal, OGM, Sponsor, System admin. Can be a technical error in PRISM and needs to do a technical override.
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9 - Time Extension Amendment Process

1. **Grant Staff**
   - Monthly Status Reports

2. **Grant Support Staff**
   - PRISM generates an e-mail re: 90 days prior to grant end date

3. **Sponsor**
   - PRISM Amendment request

4. **Section Manager / Deputy Director / Board**
   - Receive and evaluate written amendment request from a sponsor

5. **Grant/Support Staff**
   - Write up the amendment and recommendation, route to section mgr.

6. **Section Manager / Deputy Director / Board**
   - Section manager evaluates & initials request

7. **Section Manager / Deputy Director / Board**
   - Discuss time extension with Grant Manager; Renegotiate w/ sponsor

8. **Grant/Support Staff**
   - Deputy Director signs amendment and route to support staff
   - Amendment to agreement in PRISM
   - Mail amendment to sponsor, file copies in chrono and project files

End
Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps

**Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office**

**9 - Time Extension Amendment Process**

- **Grant Staff**
  - Apply amendment to agreement in PRISM
  - Mail amendment to sponsor, file copies in chrono and project files

- **Grant/Support Staff**
  - Support staff generates & routes extension for amendment

- **Director / Board**
  - Director reviews and signs or initials amendment and routes to support staff
  - End

- **Fiscal Staff**
  - Fiscal Staff approves amendment
  - End

- **Sponsor**
  - Board reviews amendment

- **Section Manager / Deputy Director / Board**
  - Require Director approval

- **End**
  - Require Board approval
  - Skip Board approval altogether?

- **No**
  - Require Board approval
  - Approve?

- **Yes**
  - Approve?
  - End

- **A**
  - Director reviews and signs or initials amendment and routes to support staff

- **B**
  - Skip Board approval altogether?
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10 - Interim Reimbursement Process

**Sponsor**
- Sponsor submits invoice & progress report
- Invoices are dated stamped & forwarded to Fiscal

**Support Staff**
- Invoices are complete
- About 5% or less are so bad that they are returned to the sponsor
- Review contact sponsor if necessary for missing info
- Review invoice & progress report
- How many of these eventually get paid? Suspend instead of sending back. Do administrative amendments to clear suspended invoices.

**Fiscal Staff**
- Review for completeness and note missing info
- Enter all info available in PRISM
- Print out the green sheet. Write any questions on the bottom Billing summary route to Grant managers with paperwork
- Delete billing from PRISM. Admin files and sends billing packet back to sponsor
- File and sends billing packet back to sponsor
- Mail warrant if necessary, send A-19 for this payment and new A-19 for next payment.

**Grant Manager**
- Contact sponsor re: missing info
- Review contact sponsor if necessary for missing info
- Prepare a letter to return with invoice to sponsor. Note reason on Billing Checklist. Forward to Fiscal.

**End**
11 - Project Closeout

Sponsor

1. Prepare Final billing request or request to close the project

2. Site Inspection required?
   - Yes
     - PRISM
       - Print Project Inspection Report
       - Determine if other inspections needed; Plan route
   - No
      - PRISM
        - Project Inspection Report

3. PRISM
   - Visit site & take photos; Perform inspection; Complete Project Inspection Report
   - Complete inspection module fields in PRISM; Download photos.

4. PRISM
   - Pass inspection?
     - Yes
     - Notification
     - Sometimes support staff will send a formal letter
     - No
       - Notify sponsor re: compliance issue; Request resolution
   - Final report
     - Transaction docs
     - Construction plans

5a. PRISM
   - Verify project measurements; Map the project in GIS (IT)
   - Certification in PRISM
   - Print Final – In Compliance Letter; Mail to sponsor; File in project file & chrono

6. Notification
   - Sometimes support staff will send a formal letter

7. Review final documents
   - Final report
   - Transaction docs
   - Construction plans

8. Print Final – In Compliance Letter; Mail to sponsor; File in project file & chrono

9. PRISM
   - Certification in PRISM
   - Print Final – In Compliance Letter; Mail to sponsor; File in project file & chrono

10. Make corrections. Notify RCO project is ready for followup

This letter should be specific to the project.
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11 - Project Closeout

Support Staff

14 Review for completeness and accuracy work with grant manager until we can pay.

Fiscal Staff

15 Update any changes to info in PRISM

16 Release payment in PRISM

17 Process payments in AFRS.

18 Mail warrant if necessary, send A-19 for this payment and new A-19 for next payment.

19 File documentation

End

Grant Manager

11 Review file; Approve final invoice

Sometimes Grant Manager waits for amendments before closing the project

Project is mapped in GIS at this point

Billing packet

PRISM

Billing packet

PRISM

Billing packet

AFRS

Billing packet

PRISM

Billing packet

PRISM

Billing packet

PRISM

Billing packet

PRISM

Billing packet

PRISM
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Recreation and Conservation Office
11 - Project Closeout

Support Staff

22. Prepare project for featured project on Website (Grant manager)

23. Scan and attach agreements & amendments to PRISM (6 months after closing) (Support Staff)

24. Send files to record center; Assign tracking numbers to each project file in PRISM

End

Fiscal Staff

Grant Manager

PRISM

Project file

Project file

PRISM

B
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Recreation and Conservation Office
12 - Compliance Inspection
Page - 1

1. Print Inspection Due Report for inspections required
   PRISM
   PRISM
   PRISM
4. Input inspection results in PRISM
   PRISM
5. Print Post-Completion – In Compliance Letter.
   PRISM
6. Mail letter; File in project file and chrono
   In-compliance letter
   End

Grant Manager
Support Staff
Sponsor
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Recreation and Conservation Office
12 - Compliance Inspection
Page 2 - Conversion sub-map

A Discuss situation with grant manager
9 Find replacement property; Notify RCO
10 Appraisals
Maps
Deeds
Easements
Enviro
assessment
Cultural survey
14 Follow procedures and prepare and submit documents
11 Discuss document and procedure requirements with sponsor
13 Briefing memo
15 Review and evaluate documents; Prepare briefing memo
16 Make decision on replacement
17 Notify sponsor

8 Mail letter; File in project file and chrono
7 Print Post-Completion – Out of Compliance Letter; Move project to active complete status in PRISM
12 Discuss replacement with RCO management
11 Perform a site inspection on converted and replacement property
12 Equivalent replacement?
Yes
No
13

PRISM
Grant Manager
Start Conversion process
PRISM
Director/Board
Section Manager
Appendix C - As-is (current) Process Maps

Recreation and Conservation Office
12 - Compliance Inspection
Page – 3 - Conversion sub-map

Sponsor

18 Record deed of right on replacement property or build replacement facility → Deed of right
A

21 Sign amendment; Return to RCO → Amendment

Support Staff

19 Perform desk review or site inspection

Grant Manager

20 Process amendment; Send to sponsor → PRISM
Amendment

Fiscal Staff

22 Apply amendment into PRISM → PRISM
Amendment

23 Move project to closed status in PRISM → End