

**INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE
AND
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY**

PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT

This Agreement is made and entered into by and between the Recreation and Conservation Office, hereinafter referred to as "RCO," and the Department of Ecology, hereinafter referred to as "ECY," pursuant to the authority granted by Chapter 39.34 RCW.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Agreement is to provide funding from Ecology (ECY) to the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) to complete a contract with a sub-recipient to develop Large Project Budget Standards, as described in the Scope of Work included herein as Attachment A (the SOW).

PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

This Agreement shall become effective on October 15, 2018, or date of execution, whichever is later, and will expire on June 30, 2019, unless terminated sooner or extended as provided herein.

STATEMENT OF WORK

The RCO and ECY shall provide the following services to develop Large Project Budget Standards:

Contracting & Management

- RCO will enter into a contract with South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group to complete the SOW.
- RCO will provide grant management oversight, performance, milestone review, and other related support for completion of the described work by the sub-recipient
- RCO will review and approve invoices from sub-recipient

Related Activities

- RCO and ECY will each delegate a technical staff person to be part of the technical team described in the SOW.
- RCO and ECY will use the Align Workgroup to complete review of draft products among participating grant programs in furtherance of this work.
- RCO and ECY will provide the contractor access to grant administration staff as necessary to complete the SOW.

COMPENSATION AND PAYMENT

ECY shall pay RCO an amount not to exceed Three Thousand Dollars (\$3,000). This amount is a portion of the total necessary for the RCO to accomplish its work requirements. The remainder is to be provided by the Department of Fish & Wildlife's Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program and RCO.

RCO shall submit quarterly requests for payment under this Agreement. Upon receipt and approval of the properly executed invoices, ECY will remit payment to RCO in a total amount not to exceed the value of this Agreement.

DISPUTES

Disputes arising under this Agreement shall be resolved by a panel consisting of one representative from RCO, one representative from ECY, and a mutually agreed upon third party. The dispute panel shall thereafter decide the dispute with the majority prevailing.

TERMINATION

Either party may terminate Agreement upon ten (10) days written notice to the other party. In the event of termination of this Agreement, the terminating party shall be liable only for performance rendered or costs incurred in accordance with the terms of this Agreement prior to the effective date of termination.

AGREEMENT CHANGES, MODIFICATIONS AND AMENDMENTS

This Agreement may be changed, modified, or amended by written agreement executed by both parties.

MANAGEMENT

The program manager for each of the parties shall be responsible for and shall be the contact person for all communications and billings regarding the performance of this Agreement.

The RCO Program Manager is Tara Galuska, PO Box 40917, Olympia, WA 98504-0917, (360) 902-2638.

The ECY Program Manager is Scott McKinney, PO Box 47600, Olympia, WA 98504-7600, (360) 407-6131

EXECUTION

We, the undersigned, agree to the terms of the foregoing Agreement.

DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

**RECREATION AND CONSERVATION
OFFICE**

Polly Zehm, Deputy Director

Scott T. Robinson, Deputy Director

Date

Date

Attachment A

SCOPE OF WORK LARGE PROJECT BUDGET STANDARDS

BACKGROUND

Budget structure and the language used to define phases, elements and worksites of a project are what fundamentally define a proposal and contract in publically funded ecosystem management work. Increasingly, ecosystem management involves large-scale, protracted efforts with multiple phases and elements, funded by many grants over a project lifecycle. If we have a common budget structure and language, we can reduce redundancy in application development, and increase the opportunity for more coordinated proposal review, funding, contract management, and reporting among grant programs.

PRODUCT OVERVIEW

We will develop **large project budget standards** that meets the application requirements of major state and federal funding programs in Washington State. This will allow development of a single whole project budget, as a basis for both application and contracting among multiple grant programs to support the whole lifecycle of a large protracted ecosystem project effort. The whole project budget will describe all phases, tasks and costs of a large project, which can then be used to efficiently extract funding requests for diverse grant programs, or support single contracts that combine multiple funding sources. This system will provide the following benefits:

- Reduced time in developing new grant proposals.
- Improved ability to evaluate match among multiple funding sources (enabling future match streamlining).
- Increased flexibility and reduced effort in adjusting scope and funding allocation among multiple grants.
- Improved post-construction assessment of total project costs.
- Increased transparency of whole project scope during grant review.
- Increase potential for future funder-to-funder discussions that: 1) ensure high-priority projects receive an even flow of funding, 2) enable streamlining of contracting and reporting, and 3) facilitate shared proposal review or project audits.

Existing grant program budget requirements may be based on law, policy, or preference. The master project budget structure is anticipated to resolve discrepancies among grant programs, including but not limited to:

- **Task-based vs. Object Class-based Budget Structure.** Federal contract budgets are fundamentally object class-based (personnel, supplies, travel, contracts etc.), while many state contracts are task and deliverable based. The fundamental matrix of the master budget will likely include a matrix of phased tasks cross tabulated by object classes.
- **Phase and Site Language.** Different programs use different words to describe the different phases of a project, or locations where work may occur.

- **Level of Detail.** Some programs itemize all costs, while other programs contract on deliverables and allow for flexibility among tasks. The master budget will provide a summary by tasks, however additional worksheets can provide itemization of costs where required by a particular award.
- **Allocation of Multiple Awards.** Different awards accumulate over time providing different levels of funding among tasks. The master budget will likely include a second cross-tabulation between phased tasks and each award (including in-kind contributions from the sponsor and their partners).
- **Indirect and Administrative Costs.** Different programs have different rules about allowing indirect costs and administrative costs, and so these costs must be defined and isolated in a master budget. Indirect or administrative costs can be included as an object class for each phased task for purposes of calculation, and as an item associated with each award.

DEFINITIONS

1. "RCO" – Recreation and Conservation Office as represented by the Salmon Program
2. "The Contractor" – South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group and all associates engaged in completion of this work
3. "The Technical Team" – Paul Cereghino (NOAA), RCO Budget Staff, Federal Budget Staff, Ecology Budget Staff
4. "The Grant Coordination Group" – The Align Workgroup, co-chaired by Ecology and RCO
5. "The Project Community" – Watershed Leads/LIO coordinators accessed with the assistance of Puget Sound Partnership
6. "The Focus Group" – a small handpicked group of project management volunteers recommended by the Project Community and agreed upon by the contractor and the technical team

SCOPE OF WORK

1. **KICK OFF MEETING** – The Contractor will meet with the technical team to review the scope of work, obtain existing materials and analyses, and resolve any uncertainties in this scope of work, schedule, or deliverables (The Technical Team will use an A3 to communicate the effort to stakeholders).
2. **INTERVIEW GRANT PROGRAM STAFF** – The Contractor will complete structured interviews with state and federal fiscal staff to clarify specifications and requirements around key requirements such as match, administrative costs, indirect costs, personnel costs, and phasing, and differentiating among requirements based on whether they are driven by law, policy or preference. The contractor will produce written findings.
3. **INTERVIEW FOCUS GROUP** – The Contractor will identify, assemble and interview a focus group to identify how this budget product can maximize the value realized by field practitioners through development of a shared budget structure. The contractor will produce written findings. The contractor will encourage active involvement of the focus group in this scope to the extent practicable.

4. **DEVELOP & REVIEW INTERNAL DRAFT PRODUCTS** – The contractor will develop spreadsheets, definitions, and business rules that define a draft budget structure. The contractor will provide this product to the technical team, and revise based on comments to produce an external draft.
5. **DEVELOP & REVIEW EXTERNAL DRAFT PRODUCT** – The contractor will obtain written review comments on an external draft product from the grant coordination group and the focus group. Based on those review comments, the contractor will revise the draft product and provide the revised draft to the technical team as a final draft.
6. **FINAL PRODUCT REVISION** – The contractor will meet with the technical team and walk through and discuss the final draft product. Based on that meeting and associated “punch list”, the contractor will produce and deliver a final deliverable to the technical team.

DELIVERABLES

1. **Interview Findings** – an informal and brief summary of findings from interviews with grant program staff and the focus group.
2. **Master Budget Table Spreadsheet** – an easy to use, well-structured, clearly labeled and visually appealing spreadsheet consistent with definitions and business rules that allows for the development of a comprehensive project budget, that can be used to generate multiple subordinate grant proposal requests.
3. **Project Detail Spreadsheets** – Subordinate spreadsheets, which provide additional cost details for a cell, row, or column within the master budget table, as required by specific grant programs.
4. **Standard Terms and Definitions** – a proposal for common language among grant programs describing phases, project elements, types of costs, and work locations, as represented in the master budget and project detail.
5. **Business Rules** – A 5-10 pages, terse and well-structured document indicating how to use the spreadsheets to prepare a whole project budget and associated subordinate application budgets.

SCHEDULE

The project will begin upon execution of the contract. The project will be completed by June 30, 2019. The project end date may be modified by the mutual written agreement of the contractor and RCO.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COST BREAKDOWN

Element	Hours	Rate	Labor	Travel	Total
KICKOFF	8	\$50.00	\$ 400.00		
PRORAM INTERVIEWS	16	\$50.00	\$ 800.00	\$100.00	
FOCUS INTERVIEW	8	\$50.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 50.00	
INDEPENDENT WORK	50	\$50.00	\$ 2,500.00		
DRAFT MEETING & REVISION	24	\$50.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 50.00	

FINAL MEETING & REVISION	24	\$50.00	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 50.00	
SPREADSHEET WORK	10	\$40.00	\$ 400.00		
Direct Total	140		\$ 6,900.00	\$250.00	\$ 7,150.00
Indirect (25%)					\$ 1,788.00
Total					\$ 8,938.00