



## PRISM Modifications

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) revised their reporting metrics in the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund (PCSRF) database. We are working with NOAA and the RCO's programmers to make significant updates to PRISM to implement the new metrics. Funds from the 2008 and 2009 PCSRF grants will fund the work. We hope to have most of the work completed this summer.

In addition, RCO has been working on a module in PRISM for progress and final reports. This module will increase communication between RCO staff and sponsors. Lead entities and regions also will have access to help with tracking project progress. This should be completed by the end of summer.

## Project Administration

Since the beginning of the salmon recovery effort in 1999, 1,539 projects have been funded. As of July 16, 2009, sponsors have completed 1,003 projects (about 65.2 percent).

Funding Cycle	Fiscal Year	Active Projects	Pending Projects	Completed Projects	Total
GSRO Federal 1999	1999	0	0	163	163
Early Action (IRT) State 1999	1999	0	0	94	94
SRFB - Early (State) 2000	2000	2	0	87	90
SRFB - Second Round 2000	2001	3	0	145	148
SRFB - Third Round 2001	2002	2	0	130	132
SRFB - Fourth Round 2002	2003	13	0	75	88
SRFB – Fifth Round 2004	2004	32	0	81	113
SRFB – Sixth Round 2005	2006	49	0	60	109
SRFB – Seventh Round 2006	2007	61	0	36	99
SRFB – 2007 Grant Round ( <i>includes PSAR</i> )	2008	214	0	14	228
SRFB – 2008 Grant Round <sup>i</sup>	2009	102	6 <sup>ii</sup>	0	108
Family Forest Fish Passage Program	To Date	52	309 <sup>iii</sup>	118	170
<b>Totals</b>		<b>530</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1003</b>	<b>1,539</b>
<b>Percent</b>		<b>34.44%</b>	<b>.003%</b>	<b>65.2%</b>	

IRT: Interagency Review Team (Early Action grant cycle);  
 GSRO: Governor's Salmon Recovery Office

<sup>i</sup> The numbers in the table include some "programmatic grants," so the 2008 grant round totals differ from those in the text.

<sup>ii</sup> These projects are awaiting signature. A project is not under agreement ("active") until both parties have signed.

<sup>iii</sup> FFFPP projects landowners that have applied to the program and are waiting to become a high priority for funding. These projects are not included in totals.



of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (board). GSRO will take the lead in administering the lead entity program.

Budget Challenges

Moving GSRO and lead entity administration to RCO was intended to improve efficiency and realize budget savings. Limited funding has been the greatest challenge with the transition of GSRO and lead entity administration. While the budget reduced GSRO's FTE level from four staff to three, RCO gained one FTE for administration of lead entities. Given this, the agency assigned responsibilities for lead entity administration to the GSRO. However, the lead entity funds are insufficient to support a full staff. Given the limits to the GF-S budget, RCO must use more federal funds to support the lead entity program than originally planned.

General Fund – State Budget Reductions

On June 18, Governor Gregoire ordered an additional 2 percent reduction to general funds (GF-S), targeting a reduction in staff that are supported with GF-S dollars. The funding for the GSRO and the lead entity program are the largest GF-S funded programs at RCO and thus took the largest proportionate share of the 2% reduction. RCO reached some of its target by capturing savings from GF-S funded vacancies (both the GSRO Executive Coordinator and the agency Policy Director).

The remaining GF-S reduction was distributed based on proportion of GF-S funding per program. There is indication that additional GF-S cuts will be made if future revenue forecasts show continuing decrease in state funds. The following table shows the effect to lead entities and the GSRO for both 2 percent and 5 percent cuts.

	<b>09 – 11 GF-S As passed by legislature</b>	<b>Percentage of RCO's GF-S</b>	<b>2% reduction*</b>	<b>5% reduction</b>
<b>GSRO</b>	\$448,000	14.6%	\$13,033	\$28,280
<b>Lead Entity Administration</b>	\$100,000	3.3%	\$951	\$4,354
<b>Lead Entity Contracts</b>	\$1,385,000	45.1%	\$13,172	\$60,309

*\*after subtracting salaries for vacant positions, as noted above*

Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG) Support

In the past, WDFW provided significant support to LEAG. In particular, WDFW gave a \$9,000 stipend per biennium to the chair of LEAG, covered travel for Executive Committee meetings, provided coffee and lunch at meetings, and provided staff support to take and publish minutes. WDFW also maintained a \$16,000 training budget for LEAG.

RCO has not set aside funds to support LEAG in the same way. At a recent LEAG meeting, RCO staff and lead entities discussed various options for supporting two in-person meetings, two conference calls, and additional training opportunities each year. One of the options volunteered by LEAG would be to have individual lead entities contribute to the cost of items that are valuable for them. For example, if lead entities covered the cost of training registration fees, the savings could cover the cost of training and/or contribute to a stipend for the chair.

### **Integration of Functions**

Having GSRO provide administrative support to both regional recovery organizations and lead entities presents an opportunity to integrate functions when it makes sense to do so.

One of the early accomplishments of the transition has been the integration of contracts for the regional recovery organization and the lead entity when those organizations are one and the same. The contracts with Hood Canal Coordinating Council, Yakima Basin Fish and Wildlife Recovery Board, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, and the Snake River Salmon Recovery Board now reflect deliverables for both regional recovery and lead entity responsibilities. This efficiency also recognizes the intrinsic relationship between regional recovery planning implementation and lead entities.

Discussions are underway with the regional recovery organizations and lead entities that are housed in separate agencies to identify how they can better connect their work and support the other's goals.

### **Next Steps**

RCO staff suggests that the board consider and discuss the following questions at the August meeting.

- What advisory role does the board expect from lead entities and the regional organizations? Should the advisory function be separate or integrated? Are there other models to consider beyond LEAG and COR that would interest the board?
- RCO/GSRO fully supports lead entities gathering together as a collective for learning and networking opportunities but has no funding to support these activities. Should RCO be directed to find the dollars to support these or are existing dollars already allocated to lead entities sufficient to support LEAG's activities?