

**WRIA 14 Lead Entity Committee
Mason Public Works Mtg RM A
2/16/2017**

Jan/Feb 2017 Progress Review

Group reviewed CAC graphic (see attached) that describes the interaction between TAG and CAC. Takeaways from the diagram: TAG members may participate in CAC aside from project sponsors or individuals with a conflict of interest (CofI). CAC is responsible for reviewing TAG ranked list and make changes if needed with a 2/3 majority vote and a written justification of how changes reflect citizens advisory committee prioritization guidance. Group reviewed other milestones from Jan/Feb 2017 and To-Do list (revise conflict of interest statement, develop citizen guidance, and recruitment strategy). During the 2/10/17 subcommittee meeting, the group addressed the items on the To-Do list. During this meeting the subcommittee also agreed upon the recommendation of removing opportunity for initiating governments to participate in CAC ranking meeting regardless of project sponsor or other conflict of interest status.

Conflict of Interest Policy Review

Two draft conflict of interest policies were distributed to the group. One version is intended for operating procedures and applies to group and committee obligations throughout the year; the other one would live in the process guide and apply specifically to the grant cycle.

Comments on CofI Policies

Everyone at table likely has some conflict (actual or perceived) at some point. These policies lay out the process of addressing them.	“Is significantly involved in the development of a project” consideration would exclude the tribe from participation in several committee activities; recommend removing it
“Other ties to the project” is meant to open the forum for committee discussion and how to address it. It accounts for the countless scenarios the committee may encounter in the future. This language has been implicit in years past.	Bulleted list of potential/perceived conflict of interest considerations places an emphasis on these items that appears to elevate them beyond a mere consideration
Two policies doesn’t require yearly revisions; operating procedures remain the same year to year; process guide is updated on an annual basis regardless	“Other ties to a project” needs to be better defined; too general; we all have outside interest that lead to obvious CofI and perceived CofI
Bullet lists are intended as examples of perceived, potential or actual conflict of interest.	Consider including separate definitions for actual, perceived, potential and no conflict.
Alternative to this process; any member may bring up CofI at any time.	Policy lacks details on how define benefits beyond financial.
Under RCW 77.85, community participation is required and is an important component for the future of salmon recovery. A neighbor may be unhappy with the project while the community embraces it	Policy in two different locations can be problematic if they don’t match perfectly there will be trouble. Need to match 100%.

Policies recommend that members disclose potential Cofl to coordinator via email. Coordinator will compile and distribute them for everyone to see. Members who bring a concern forth about others may request their names be redacted at this time. Group will discuss at monthly meeting prior to rating and ranking and decide on course of action for individual depending if it's actual, potential or perceived Cofl. Project sponsors aren't allowed to give a sales pitch on the day of the ranking because project presentations will precede ranking meeting. A member finds this new process to be potentially cumbersome.

Recommendation for revision to Cofl policy: remove bullets and instead incorporate list as examples that may warrant additional conversation from committee. Provide the framework for how a person can present a Cofl to the committee, their deliberation and decision. Coordinator will make changes based on these recommendations and distribute to prepare for final approval at April 20, 2017 meeting.

Citizen's Guidance

Next the group reviewed the draft citizen's guidance. The Citizen's Advisory Committee will use this guidance during the final rating and ranking of projects and recommend changes requiring a 2/3 majority vote and a written justification. TAG members who aren't project sponsors can be a member of the CAC. Recruitment for TAG only participants has also occurred; individuals with technical knowledge that have less capacity to commit to the process but will participate in site visit, project presentations, ranking and rating and final TAG deliberation (Rick Carlson for instance). This draft citizen guidance was adopted from Skagit and the subcommittee who met on Feb 10, 2017 elaborated on it.

Comments on Citizen's Guidance

The mission of the SRFB is salmon habitat recovery. As an expressed priority, a project may meet this criteria but fail other criteria such as neighboring landowner support. How will this criteria work with other project components to impact final ranking?	Not every project has to meet each requirement; it's merely guidance. Education and community outreach are bonuses. They come into play when two projects have similar scores for other aspects but one has more education and outreach benefits.
Under project costs, some projects cost a lot more than others. The guidance language should specify what are the criteria for comparison; amongst all projects on the list? Perhaps too onerous. Instead if the project costs a lot more than "normal" then the TAG needs to provide an explanation to the CAC regarding the extra expense and why it is justified.	Education is an important component but there are a lot of great projects that don't lend to education and outreach. With education listed in this guidance it may cause projects to be de-ranked because it lacks an educational component.
Use of the word "expensive" may be perceived as negative	Revise sheet so that it clearly calls out salmon recovery has the primary concern with community values as a secondary concern
Simplify project costs questions to "Is this project cost justified? If so explain? What opportunities have been gained or lost?"	Community values should be a deliberate conversation and recorded during the final ranking meeting.
Take away: what's the bang for the buck of this project? Are there other funds that may work?	

What is a quorum? What are committee recruitment quota goals?

To conduct a vote, a quorum of 1/3 of the eligible voting members or a minimum of 5 eligible voting members is required. A quick estimate of eligible voting members was made; approximately 12 TAG members with at least 3 with a likely CofI and 3 non-technical citizen members.

Minimum requirements for TAG and Committee participation and voting qualifications mentioned. Live or work with the lead entity; have some level of expertise

Recruitment should be an ongoing task; people come and go. What is too large? Group hasn't reached that point so continue recruitment and once a tipping point is reached restart this conversation.

Review Grant timeline/letter of intent

Letter of Intent is similar to previous but a four year work plan section has been added. Letters of Intent that are additions to the four year work plan need to complete this section. Other updates to the four year work plan will be included in the fall. LOI/4YWP and 2017 grant timeline announcement was sent out on 2/10. Responses due by COB 3/10.

Project presentations will occur on June 22, 2017. Committee member attendance is helpful; since site visits are ultimately geared to the review panel. Ranking sheets can be distributed at project presentations but won't be due that day. Coordinator will compile ranking sheets and a spreadsheet for discuss at final TAG ranking meeting. Separating rating and ranking eliminates a whole day meeting, allows for additional deliberation and review of project applications, relieves time crunch for coordinator. The final ranking meetings for the TAG and CAC maybe short if group elects to adopt list as is. May 10th for site visits is still tentative; awaiting confirmation from RCO.