



STATE OF WASHINGTON

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

August 29, 2006

**TO:** SRFB Members and Designees

**FROM:** Laura E. Johnson, Director

**PREPARED BY:** Neil Aaland, Assistant Director *LEJ na*

**SUBJECT:** "Criteria for Success" (formerly "criteria for incomplete")

Background

At the June 8-9 meeting in Walla Walla, the Board discussed the process for making the funding decisions in December. Public testimony suggested that the Board should consider developing criteria for assessing how well a regional area performed in working toward preparing, and recommending funding for, its lists of projects. A lower performance could theoretically result in a reduction of or a delay in a region receiving its full project allocation.

The Board expressed concern about a potential reduction in the amount of funding a regional area would receive, thinking this could have a negative impact on the relationship between regional organizations and lead entities. However, the Board was interested in exploring whether, under some circumstances, a regional area might need to do additional work on its allocation process, and thus a delay in receiving funding might be warranted.

The Board directed staff to develop some potential criteria, work with the Council of Regions (COR) and Lead Entity Advisory Group (LEAG), and come to the September meeting with a proposal. In response, staff did the following:

- Prepared an initial draft of proposed criteria
- Circulated the initial draft to a small self-selected subcommittee of Lead Entity coordinators
- Met with Council of Regions and solicited their comments
- Revised the draft and met with LEAG



### Assumptions

1. At the June meeting, the SRFB accepted each regional area's proposed process for this grant round, and recognized that differences existed between approaches across the state. The Board acknowledged that greater flexibility should be shown this year because of the transition to a region-based allocation.
2. The primary measure of success for this grant round should be how well a region followed the process it laid out in its homework response, including any enhancements that may have been developed since the homework was submitted.

For future grant rounds, and at a later SRFB meeting, the Board will need to consider how these different processes worked and what kind of guidance will be needed.

### Considerations and Recommendations for Criteria for Success

1. What specific criteria could be used?
  - a. Recommendations for criteria:
    - Is the regional process focused on the priorities of the recovery plan? (H-M-L, or Y/N?)
    - How did the process use your recovery plan? (H-M-L)
    - How did your internal Independent science review process work? (H-M-L)
    - Are affected parties, primarily Lead Entities, supportive of the results for this grant round? (H-M-L, or Y/N?)
2. How could criteria be measured?
  - a. Recommendations for measurement:
    - The primary yardstick for measuring success would be comparing the regional area's process and resulting project lists to the homework assignment responses.
    - Staff (SRFB salmon team staff and the Review Panel leader) will review the responses to the homework assignment, the Review Panel report, and any other relevant information, and evaluate how well the criteria have been met.
3. What happens if the staff review concludes that a regional area does not meet the criteria, or that some are particularly successful?

- a. Recommendations for staff conclusions (staff would recommend one of the following three conclusions):
- The process worked well and the pre-allocation is validated; or
  - There are some specific shortcomings and there are additional steps that the regional area should take, but the shortcomings can be corrected or conditioned without delaying an allocation; or
  - There are some specific shortcomings and there are additional steps that the regional area should take, and these are significant enough that the allocation should be delayed.
    1. The allocation should be delayed until the next Board meeting; or
    2. The allocation should be delayed until staff receives confirmation that the conditions are adequately met.

This evaluation will be part of the draft and final staff report prepared for the Board's funding meeting in December.

#### Questions for Board

1. Do these criteria seem useful to you? Any additions or changes?
2. Do you agree that the responses to the April homework assignment should be used as the basis for measuring success?
3. Do you agree that the staff report should include recommendations on whether an allocation should be delayed, as discussed in item #3 above?