HANDSHAKE PROGRAM

Partnership Webinar
Prepared by Heath Kruger
Handshake Program Coordinator
August 14, 2019



"The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the authors(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation."





Today's Webinar

- History of the Handshake Program
- Program Accomplishments
- FY 20: Application Process





Program History/Purpose

- Program originated in 2004
- Resulted from Partners Conference in Los Angeles
- Created to encourage community engagement
- Promote mutually beneficial activities




L to R: Cori Brown, Phil Benge, Greg Miller, Jeff Boutwell, Debra Stokes, Dick Otto, Mike Hosey, Chris Gallagher, and Mark Wilms





Program History/Purpose

- Requires a formal agreement to achieve a mutually beneficial project (not just two people informally shaking hands)
- This is NOT a grant or granting program, although it looks very similar.
 It is an internal partnership stimulator.







Eligibility

Handshake funds are administered through a challenge partnership agreement. The authority for the challenge partnership program provides opportunities for <u>public and</u> non-Federal groups and individuals to contribute to and participate in the operation and/or management of RECREATION FACILITIES and NATURAL RESOURCES at Corps water resource development projects.

EP 1130-2-500, Chapter 12





Basics

Challenge Partnerships Projects

- Corps facilities and resources <u>maintained at 100%</u>
 <u>Corps expense</u>
- Agreement with a <u>non-federal</u> public or private entity
- Within current spending authorities and in approved OMP





Investment (FY 04 – FY19)

Handshake Funds: \$ 2,948,224

(178 project recipients)

Corps Offices: \$ 2,559,752

Partners: \$8,379,935

Total: \$ 13,887,911

*60% was contributed by Partners from a total of 560





HANDSHAKE PROJECTS RECEIVING FUNDING

- There have been 104 different lake projects or offices that have received Handshake funding.
- 40 of those projects have received funds multiple times.
- 64 projects have received funds one time.







MOST HANDSHAKE AWARDS

Lakes

•	Raystown Lake – 7	last won 2017
•	Allatoona - 5	last won 2015
•	Lake Shelbyville - 5	last won 2017
•	Mark Twain – 5	last won 2016
•	Carlyle Lake – 4	last won 2016
•	Lake Mendocino – 4	last won 2015
•	Philpott Lake – 4	.last won 2014
•	W Kerr Scott - 4	.last won 2016

Divisions

•	LRD 25 awards Iotal \$1,078,297
•	MVD 43 awards Total \$3,906,805
•	NAD 21 awards Total \$999,814
•	NWD 30 awardsTotal \$2,124,639
•	SAD 37 awards Total \$2,944,089
•	SPD 10 awards Total \$713,432
•	SWD 16 awards Total \$1 796 953







HANDSHAKE PROJECTS WITH 1 PARTNER

- There have been 87 projects awarded that only had 1 partner assisting the Corps.
- In 2014 the PAC introduced bonus points for multiple partners. Before 2014 there were 119 Handshake projects with 187 partners meaning the winning projects averaged 1.57 partners.
- Since 2014 there has been average of 5.7 partners per project.
- 74% of handshake partners have signed on in the last 5 years.





Why Partner? & Why Handshake?





Handshake Partnership Program Time Line

Applications Period Begins	July
Application Deadline	Sep
Recipients Announced	Nov
Agreement Deadline	Aug
Expend Funds	2 yrs

- funds will be transmitted to District/Project via FAD





Application Information

https://corpslakes.erdc.dren.mil/employees/hand shake/handshake.cfm






How To Prepare a Winning Handshake Application

- Applications
- Evaluation Criteria
- Scoring
- Handshake Program









Handshake Partnership Program Plan Ahead

- Partnerships take time
- September may seem like a ways off but it will come quickly.
- Determine your project
- Work with prospective partners
- ·Identify needs and each partner's contribution







Program Future

- •<u>Total program</u>: \$200,000 (up to \$25,000 per project)
- •Quarterly reporting: Funded projects will have to provide a status update every quarter.
- •Incentive Points:
 - 1. This project will be completed with a national MOU partner with which the Lake or Project hasn't previously partnered. (100 points).
 - 2. This project reduces O&M cost to the Corps over the lifecycle of the proposed project or improves existing infrastructure. (100 points).





Applications

- •Describe the partnership and the work to be accomplished.
- •Include the basic who, what, when, where, how.
- •Include:
 - Who will accomplish each task
 - •Are there:
 - New facilities
 - Renovations to existing facilities
 - Research
 - Visitor services
 - Cultural or natural resources preserved
 - Educational or interpretive products created





Applications

A good application includes a description about

- the partners,
- the project, and
- the overall benefit of the partnership to the project

It must also tell us why the proposed project is valuable. Don't assume we already know.





Specifically address how the project will meet the following six evaluation criteria

Longevity / O&M

- Partnership Value
- Environmental Stewardship Value
- Recreational Benefit
- Communication and Education Value
- Innovativeness

Projects that can show benefits in multiple categories compete better.



Rathbun Lake







Longevity/ O&M - What is the life span of the product and the benefit to the Corps?

- •What is long term benefit of the project?
- •How long do you estimate it will be around?
- •What is long term cost?
- •Will there be on-going maintenance required?
- •By whom?
- •Will the project be removed or closed if maintenance is required but not funded?
- Longer term benefit and less O&M compete better



- b. Partnership Value What is the significance of the partner and their contribution to the project (i.e. critical partner, matching dollars, materials, in-kind services, etc.)?
- •This category incorporates both the value of the partner and the value of their contributions.
- •More partners compete better because there is a stronger partnering benefit and more potential contribution.
- •The value of the partner to the COE makes the application more attractive.
- Higher % of partner contribution compete better





Recreational Benefit - Does the project improve the overall recreational experience for the project's users? Does it provide opportunities for various user types?

- •What experiences are created?
- •Who benefits?
- •Are there multiple user groups?



•The more diverse and multi-functioning the recreation experience can be, the better the application.



Environmental Stewardship Value – How does the project contribute to the natural world, and the improvement of the Corps' natural and/or cultural resources?

- Pollinator projects
- Invasive species control
- Aquatic & fisheries habitat improvements
- Wildlife habitat improvements
- Trails
- Research
- Improvements to the natural environment usually score higher



Communication and Education Value – This includes both effort and impact of that effort through interpretation, outreach, education and public information?



- •It is important to show the effort in education
- •It is important to show the impact of the efforts.
- •Is there interactivity or is everything static?
- •Explain how the benefits of the project are conveyed to the public and how the project improves the USACE image.



US Army Corps of Engineers.

Innovativeness: Describe the innovative nature of the partnership or the project.

Why is this partnership or project important and unique?



- •What makes this idea so different?
- •Why is it special?
- •Is the partnership innovative or is it the project? Explain the difference if there is one.
- Convince the reader, "Wow, that is different."



Application suggestions:

Don't assume the reader knows what you know.

Project diversity is good, but not required.

Provide the information in an easy to read format.

Follow directions.

Don't assume the reader knows what you know





Scoring:

Each application is evaluated and scored 1-10 for each criteria, then weighted.

- Longevity / O&M (15%)
- Partnership Value (20%)
- Recreational Benefit (20%)
- Environmental Stewardship Value (20%)
- Communication and Education Value (15%)
- Innovativeness (10%)

Maximum score for each application is 200 points per evaluator (usually 8 evaluators).





Scoring:

Each PAC member evaluates all applications and submits scores to coordinator.

Scores are combined to get total score (1,600 maximum)

Then bonus points are added...
AND

Points are deducted (not following directions).







Projects are ranked in the order of total score.

Funds are disbursed according to evaluation score ranking until expended.

It is possible that the lowest ranked funded project will not receive all requested funds.

Handshake Partnership Program Manage Expectations

In 2012 there were:

- 36 applications submitted
- 13 were selected to receive funds (36%)

In 2013 there were:

- · 27 applications submitted
- 11 were selected to receive funds (41%)

In 2014 there were:

- 26 applications submitted
- 13 were selected to receive funds (50%)

In 2015 there were:

- 33 applications submitted
- 13 were selected to receive funds (39%)

In 2016 there were:

- 23 applications submitted
- 16 were selected to receive funds (70%)



In 2017 there were:

15 applications submitted

9 were selected to receive funds (60%)

In 2018 there were:

18 applications submitted

7 were selected to receive funds (38%)

In 2019 there were:

15 applications submitted

6 were selected to receive funds (38%)





- •Is the Handshake Program the right fit for this project or this year?
- •If so, start NOW, hopefully your partners are already on board.
- •Determine your project its not too late, but waiting longer makes the process much harder
- Work with prospective partners
- Identify needs and each partner's contribution





GOOD LUCK!

If there are questions, contact Heath Kruger

Email: Heath.R.Kruger@usace.army.mil

Phone: 402.995.2716





