

## Umbrella Project Review Schedule and Instructions

**Background:**

The Council’s 2013 Geographic Category Review recommendation included two reporting requirements for umbrella projects:

1. On an informational basis, umbrella project sponsors will (a) report annual administrative costs to the Council at the end of each calendar year of and (b) provide an annual summary of projects implemented under the umbrella solicitations. The annual summary will describe project actions to date and include the following information: sponsor, project cost, project title, location and short project summary, including anticipated benefits to fish and wildlife, and implementation timeline.
2. Funding recommendations beyond 2016 will be based on a Council-facilitated performance/effectiveness review every two to four years using the tailored questions from the Geographic Review’s proposal form for umbrella projects. The review also will include a workshop with presentations for sponsors and partners. The first review will take place early-mid 2016.

Please see Attachment 1 for additional detail regarding the Programmatic Issue for Umbrella Projects.

This review addresses reporting requirement #2 above for the performance/effectiveness review. We appreciate your work to provide the annual administrative cost and project information for the past two years.

**Review Schedule:**

Project summaries due from sponsors	February 1, 2017
Project presentations	February 16, 2017
ISRP report due	March 9, 2017
ISRP presentation to Council	March 15, 2017
Staff recommendations to F&W committee	May 16, 2017
Council recommendations	June 13, 2017

**INSTRUCTIONS for Project Sponsors**

- ✓ Please use the questions below (i.e., 1 – 5) to develop an Umbrella project summary report. You may be able to cut, paste and update much of this from your proposal form for the Geographic review proposal form in cbfish. You can also update information from your 2015 annual report to address requested

elements and information for calendar year 2016. However, your 2016 report should also synthesize results and lessons learned from previous years.

- ✓ For context, please review your past [ISRP reviews](#) and Council recommendations and find your original proposal form at [cbfish.org](http://cbfish.org) under Explore/Featured Reviews/Geographic/Proposals (scroll right), then click on your project number with the prefix of "GEOREV": <https://www.cbfish.org/Review.mvc/Summary/700>
- ✓ In addition to addressing the questions below, please incorporate how your project's past [ISRP review](#) comments have been addressed.
- ✓ Put into a narrative format (WORD or PDF) and email it with any attachments to Lynn Palensky [lpalensky@nwcouncil.org](mailto:lpalensky@nwcouncil.org) by 5:00 p.m. February 1, 2017.

### Questions

1. Purpose: Describe the primary purposes of the program (objectives and priorities) and how they are linked to the actions (projects) implemented through subcontracts.
2. Administrative history: Describe changes to program administration, including any anticipated changes intended to make the program more efficient and effective.
3. Project prioritization and selection: Describe the steps in the program's process to solicit, review, prioritize, and select habitat projects for implementation. Explain how the solicitation process incorporates or is consistent with other similar regional or state processes as appropriate. Attach solicitation notices/documents, ranking and scoring criteria, and overall project action/implementation plans for your project. The following outlines the information to include:

Solicitation: Describe the solicitation process and criteria. Include how the announcement is communicated and who is included in the communication, eligibility criteria for submitting proposals, types of projects funded, expressed priorities, and any other applicant requirements.

Review: Include and describe the review/scoring/prioritization criteria used to determine and select technically feasible projects. Discuss how you incorporate current scientific information and limiting factors to support the prioritization of projects. Describe feasibility factors that affect priority such as land ownership, permitting, cost, cost/benefit ratio, risk, etc. Also describe the review process, provide the qualifications of the review panel and explain how potential conflict of interest issues are avoided in project prioritization.

Selection: Describe who makes funding recommendations, who makes final funding decisions, and how potential conflicts of interest are avoided with regard to project selection and funding.

#### 4. Reporting

- a. Provide a list of funded projects to date. Include background information on the recipients of funding, including organization name and mission, project cost, project title, location and short project summary, and implementation timeline.
  - b. Describe if the restoration actions were selected for implementation using the process and criteria described under question 3. If not, what process was used? What was the project's relative rank? Were these the highest priority actions? If not, please explain why?
  - c. Describe progress toward meeting the program's objectives in the implementation of the suite of projects to date and the process to document progress. Describe this in terms of landscape-level improvements in limiting factors and response of the focal species.
    - Where are project results reported (e.g. Pisces, report repository, database)? Is progress toward program objectives tracked in a database, report, indicator, or other format? Can project data be incorporated into regional databases that may be of interest to other projects?
    - Who is responsible for the final reporting and data management?
  - d. Describe problems encountered, lessons learned, and any data collected, that will inform adaptive management or influence program priorities.
5. Provide a summary of your past annual budgets and include a breakdown of the program's administration and implementation costs (i.e., overhead costs, each subcontractor, etc.). Please include non-Bonneville cost share summary information (e.g., for overall program funding and for individual projects – percent cost share, partners).

#### **Presentations:**

Please prepare for a 20-minute presentation with 10 minutes for questions afterwards. Describe the process, objectives of funded work, effectiveness monitoring plan, adaptive management, and overall accomplishments of achieving regional goals and objectives.

We will be joined by Council and Bonneville staff, ISRP members, project partners and potentially Council members. The meeting will be open to the public.

**February 16, 2017 Presentation Schedule:**

8:30		Introductions and Overview
9:00	2002-013-01	Columbia Basin Water Transaction Program (Umbrella project, but not part of this review)
9:20		Q & A
9:30	1992-026-01	Grande Ronde Model Watershed
9:50		Q & A
10:00	2003-011-00	Columbia River Estuary Habitat Restoration
10:20		Q & A
10:30		<b>Break</b>
10:50	2009-012-00	Willamette Bi-Op Habitat Restoration
11:10		Q & A
11:20	2009-397-00	John Day Habitat Flow and Habitat Enhancement
11:40		Q & A
11:50		<b>LUNCH</b>
1:00	2010-001-00	Upper Columbia Programmatic Habitat
1:20		Q & A
1:30	2010-077-00	Tucannon River Programmatic Habitat
1:50		Q & A
2:00		<b>Break</b>
2:15		Group discussion – lessons learned, future implementation directions, policy issues and follow-up needed.
4:00		Adjourn

**Attachment 1: 2013 GEOREV Recommendation for Umbrella Projects**  
 (from <http://www.nwcouncil.org/fw/isrp/isrp2013-11/> Page 18):

B. Evaluate and Improve Umbrella Projects

As part of this review, the ISRP and Council reviewed a subset of larger habitat projects that identify, rank, select, and fund habitat project implementation in specific geographic areas. An even smaller subset of these (listed below) take a more formal approach to this and offer a solicitation for funding much like a mini-grant program for the area. For this review, we refer to the more formal approach as *umbrella projects*. The process is somewhat different for each group in the number of solicitations offered per year, the amount of funding available, how projects are scored and selected and who may apply for funding. There is one other umbrella program funded under the fish and wildlife program in which an administrative entity, serving as the coordination, administration, and reporting arm of the program and in essence functions much the same way as a granting organization -- the Columbia Basin Water Transaction Program. This program was reviewed in the RM&E category review, but can serve as a model for process, accountability and transparency for the umbrella projects reviewed in this category.

Umbrella Projects included in this review:

1. Project #1992-026-01: Grande Ronde Model Watershed
2. Project #2010-077-00: Tucannon River Programmatic Habitat
3. Project #2010-001-00: Upper Columbia Programmatic Habitat
4. Project #2003-011-00: Columbia River Estuary Habitat Restoration
5. Project #2009-012-00: Willamette Bi-Op Habitat Restoration
6. Project # 2009-397-00: John Day Habitat Flow and Habitat Enhancement<sup>1</sup>

In the case of the Columbia Basin Water Transaction Program, the administration and implementation is clear, transparent, and accountable. The program employs a standard and predictable process for identifying, ranking, and selecting projects and the ranking scoring criteria -- both the ranking sheets and the checklists - have been reviewed and approved by the Council's ISRP. The program has one more screen with the Council, and that is an "objection" process by which Council members can raise concerns or objections to any proposal on the current slate prior to it moving forward for contracting. This allows the Council to see the outcome of the process and what the anticipated benefits for each project.

---

<sup>1</sup> The John Day Habitat Flow and Habitat Enhancement Project appears to be an umbrella project as described in the proposal. Project recommendation is conditioned on review of the implementation strategy, which should also further describe their approach for implementation. If after review of the implementation strategy, the approach remains as the Council describes as an umbrella project, then Council and Bonneville will work together on how the principles for umbrella projects will apply to this project.

While the umbrella programs were created at different times, for different purposes, and have evolved over time, it is important to look at the value that each currently adds to the program. Since the sponsoring organizations are entrusted to administer a process involving rate-payer dollars, reducing conflicts of interest, or the appearance of a conflict, becomes important at all levels. They each play a coordination role and therefore social dynamics come into play to a large degree. At a minimum, the Council wants to see consistency in how processes are implemented among these umbrella projects. In reviewing these multi-million dollar umbrella programs, the Council is taking a closer look at the effectiveness and value of umbrella projects.

In terms of the scientific criteria used at this subregional level to evaluate and rank projects, the umbrella projects should all be using ISRP-reviewed criteria. Council staff developed specific questions for the proposal form that would provide the Council with information on the process from beginning to end -- solicitation to project reporting. The ISRP reviewed the projects and heard from sponsors and partners during site visits and presentations. While the ISRP makes some good observations and suggestions for future review, the Council and Bonneville have an obligation to consider the value added for each umbrella project and where it makes sense to continue or discontinue with that approach.

The Council, Bonneville and ISRP all see benefits of this approach for project implementation in a subregional area with several partners. As stated by the ISRP: *opportunity afforded by this approach to consolidate habitat restoration actions under an overarching project offers administrative efficiency and a landscape-based strategy that could benefit the region.* This approach can be efficient, and can lead to more orderly and effective implementation in a particular subregion. However, for this approach to be successful, it needs to be equitable and transparent. Moving forward in 2014, certain principles should apply to all umbrella projects that will help ensure the expectations outlined above are met for umbrella project administration.

Council Recommendation:

To achieve the above expectations about administrative streamlining, project selection efficiency, action effectiveness and transparency, the Council, working with Bonneville, developed the following list of principles that should be applied by Bonneville to the umbrella contracts' management and in sponsors' implementation. The umbrella projects under this recommendation are largely defined by their approach to: 1) serve as a coordinating entity among sponsors in a particular subregion to identify, review, and select projects; 2) use a formal project solicitation process; and 3) allocate and administer Bonneville funds to other entities for implementation.

3. Umbrella project sponsors will develop and use an implementation strategy to identify, prioritize and select restoration projects based on limiting factors and

biological benefits as described in the program and the Willamette and FCRPS Biological Opinions. This strategy should be: science-based, inclusive, impartial, and transparent. Selection, ranking and scoring criteria should be reviewed by the ISRP.

4. To avoid any conflict of interest or the appearance thereof, umbrella project sponsors should not implement habitat actions under a solicitation program that they administer. If the administering entity does engage in habitat implementation, that work should be implemented under a separate contract and the proposed work may be subject to review under the Council's scientific review process.
5. The implementation strategy should integrate the best available science and on-the-ground circumstances/conditions. In addition, when feasible, the sponsor will incorporate project cost and readiness into the implementation strategy.
6. The biological benefits of proposed habitat actions should be reviewed by technical experts.
7. If Bonneville funds for technical assistance (e.g., engineering and preliminary design) are available through the umbrella organization, those funds will be equally available to all partners developing and implementing projects.
8. On an informational basis, umbrella project sponsors will inform the Council at the end of each calendar year regarding, umbrella sponsor's administrative costs and provide a summary of projects implemented under the umbrella solicitations<sup>2</sup>.
9. Umbrella projects will be implemented through FY2016. Funding recommendation beyond 2016 would be based on outcome of and participation in a Council-facilitated performance/effectiveness review every two-four years using the tailored questions from the proposal form for umbrella projects. The review also will likely include a workshop with presentations for sponsors and partners. The first review will take place early-mid 2016.

---

<sup>2</sup> Provide an Annual Summary of project actions to date. Sponsor, project cost, project title, location and short project summary, including anticipated benefits to fish and wildlife, and implementation timeline.