The purpose of this presentation is to review some of the highlights from the process workshops that were conducted with lead entities, regions and grant managers as part of the Salmon Recovery Lean Study with the Steering Committee. For more details on the workshop results see the notes from each workshop on the website.

The following workshops were held:
- Northeast and Upper Columbia–June 25
- Middle Columbia, Lower Columbia, and Klickitat–June 28
- Coast–June 26
- Puget Sound (2 workshops)–June 12

The process workshops included documentation of process flows, what’s working well with the current process, what’s not working well, best practices and bigger picture ideas to be more efficient and effective with the Salmon Recovery project development prioritization process.
Process Themes

- Overall, there is a perception that the process is effective and efficient

- Lead entities and regions are very passionate about their work and feel that they are making a big difference in their communities

- Having dedicated staff with continuity to build relationships and understand the unique aspects of each community is really important

- Review Panel highly valued but there are lots of comments on the process for utilizing them and having continuity

- Many voiced need for more time from review panel or dedicated in-house technical staff

- Perceptions that HWS and PRISM are not adequately integrated and not supporting the most efficient process
“Low hanging fruit” in terms of readily executable projects has been “picked”

Many feel that the most impactful, complex projects aren’t supported by the current process or allocations

Conducting the process annually takes too much time and delays projects

Better coordination between funding programs and having one application/evaluation process for sponsors would make a big impact on the ability to do more projects

At which level project prioritization should occur was questioned – Lead Entity, Region, State?

Acquisition projects are more difficult to obtain community support for and are expensive
Process Flows

Process Commonalities:

- Sponsors are most commonly the ones identifying projects and there is usually some level of “pre-screening”

- Sponsors are usually entering the applications into PRISM, with some assistance from lead entities

- Most lead entities involve RCO grant managers in earlier stages of proposal process

- All are doing local technical review

- Review Panel interaction steps are fairly standardized
Process Flows

**Process Differences:**

- Level of formality and documentation of the process

- “Pre-screening” methods such vary as LOI, “pre-apps”, informal screening by TAG, call for projects, etc.

- Number, timing, criteria, constellation of reviews by citizen and/or local technical committees

- Project ranking and prioritization methods and timing, e.g. some lead entities involve regions or fiscal agents in project scoring or ranking. Some lead entities score and rank before site visits and some afterwards.
Some Workshop-Identified Issues/Pain Points:

- Too many review cycles in the process.
- Projects don’t always tie to strategy and recovery plans as well as they could.
- Systems taking excessive time to enter data.
- Issues with projects come up too late in the process.
- State Technical Review panel comments take too much time for sponsors to respond to without always adding value (e.g. because panel feedback is not always constructive or strays too much from project purpose).
- State Technical Review Panel review takes too much calendar time, delays the process (e.g. pre-apps must be in 3 weeks prior to on-site visits and it takes 3 weeks to get comments after the visits).
- State Technical Review Panel is not available after site visits until review to discuss comments or assist with project development.
Some Workshop-Identified Issues/Pain Points:

- We don’t have adequate volunteers for technical or citizen committees.
- We don’t have adequate number of sponsors or sponsors have inadequate capacity to identify and submit projects.
- Maintaining two separate local committees for citizens and technical review takes more time to manage compared to the value that it provides, time could be better spent developing projects or on outreach.
- Access to in-house engineers is limited, projects are subsequently over-engineered and too much is spent on design due to bringing in external consultants.
- The fact that the grant round is an annual process delays projects and causes us to spend more time on the selection process versus outreach and supporting project success.
- Regional process requirements take away from the more important work of developing and prioritizing projects.
Best Practices

• Scientific process to identify and prioritize projects

• Local technical review filters out projects that aren’t a good fit to strategy

• RCO grant managers providing feedback earlier helps grant rounds go smoothly

• Earlier involvement of Review Panel helps catch project issues early

• Citizen and technical committees meet frequently and together, which keeps knowledge fresh and logistics easier

• Working through citizen committees and sponsors helps influence legislators and reach land owners

• Taking legislators, elected officials and citizens committees on site tours helps educate about the process