

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Summary Minutes

Date: January 15, 2008

Place: Natural Resources Bldg. #175 A&B
Olympia, Washington

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Steven Drew	Olympia
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Dave Brittell	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Larry Fairleigh	Designee, State Parks and Recreation

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
A RECORDED TAPE IS RETAINED BY RCO AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Val Ogden called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Craig Partridge requested the agenda be modified so that the WWRP Urban Wildlife Habitat allocation formula and evaluation criteria topic could be presented after he returns from testifying across the street. The board approved the revised agenda.

MANAGEMENT REPORTS

Director Kaleen Cottingham presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #1 for detailed report.)

- **Staffing Update**
 - Kaleen introduced Patty Davis, RCO's new executive assistant and office manager.
 - Interviews for the Board Liaison position will begin in the next few weeks.
 - Jeff Parsons, Bill Chapman, and Karen Daubert have been reappointed to the board for another term.

- **Impact of Recent Floods on Projects**

The RCO is still getting feedback on the level of damage to projects from the December flood. Kaleen reported that Friends Landing in Grays Harbor County and Belfair State Park are two projects that were affected by the flood.

- **Budget Status Report**

Kaleen noted that a printed copy of the budget status report, prepared by Mark Jarasitis, fiscal manager, could be found in the board notebook under Item 1.

- Consent Calendar
Kaleen talked about removing the items on the consent calendar. She reminded the board that agency staff use their best judgment when deciding what goes on the consent calendar which, by definition, implies no discussion. If board members believe discussion is necessary, please notify Kaleen prior to the meeting so an item can be removed from the consent calendar and added to the regular agenda.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Craig Partridge **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-01 approval of the November 1 & 2, 2007, RCFB meeting minutes. Bill Chapman **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-01 **APPROVED** as presented.

TIME EXTENSIONS

As an introduction to this topic, Kaleen reminded the board of the link between time extensions and reappropriation requests to the Legislature. She also said that project sponsors are requesting the opportunity to come before the board and appeal staff-denied time extensions.

Marguerite Austin presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #3 for details.)

Staff requests the board's consideration of the time extension requests shown in Attachment A. Board action is required since these projects are more than four years old and are requesting an extension to continue the agreement beyond the four-year period established by policy.

Steven Drew expressed concern about the time extension request from WDFW's Dungeness River Match project as they have already received two time extensions and a scope change amendment.

Dave Brittell gave an update on the Dungeness River Match project. WDFW is also frustrated with the amount of time it has taken to purchase property and they are respectful of reappropriation concerns. They have also requested a reduction in the grant amount from \$1,227,862 to \$457,626 and have leveraged \$450,000 in matching funds from the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Karen Daubert is concerned with the other two projects requesting time extensions – WDFW Western Pond Turtle Phase 3 and Winthrop Community Park and Ice Rink. She suggested looking at time extension requests carefully and developing a policy to limit requests.

Marguerite noted that, if the board chooses not to approve extensions, there is a policy in place statutorily to either move the funds down the list to alternate projects or move the money forward to a new list. Our goal is to minimize reappropriation requests.

Larry Fairleigh **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-02 approving the three time extensions. Dave Brittell **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-02 **APPROVED** as presented.

POLICY COMMENTS RECEIVED

Kammie Bunes presented board members with a copy of comments received on several policy issues. She explained the process and timeline used to solicit public comments, many of which helped determine staff's recommendation on policies for board action at today's meeting.

Policy recommendations for ALEA, WWRP State Parks, and WWRP Mitigation Banking are deferred until the March board meeting.

ALEA PROGRAM POLICIES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

Staff recommends modifying the ALEA grant program to better address statutory goals to (1) enhance, improve or protect aquatic lands and (2) provide and improve access to aquatic lands. Staff also recommends modifying policy materials to provide guidance on project eligibility related to navigable water bodies. The specific changes include the following:

1. Add program goals and objectives to clarify the dual program purposes.
2. Provide further guidance on the definition of a navigable water body.
3. Provide additional guidance on the selection of evaluation team members.
4. Revise the evaluation instrument and scoring matrix to allow for enhancement and protection projects and public access projects (or components of projects) to be scored separately but with equal weight.
5. Encourage projects statewide.

Staff also recommends gathering additional public comment for proposed changes in January and February 2008 with Board action at the March 27-28 meeting.

Board discussion

Craig Partridge noted that the statutory intent for the ALEA program is to encourage both restoration/resource protection and public access to the state's navigable waters. As the criteria stand now, there are no extra points awarded to projects that meet this dual purpose. He encouraged staff to provide an incentive by awarding extra points to projects that meet both the protection and access criteria.

Steven Drew agreed with Craig's comments.

Jeff Parsons suggested that, in case of a tie, the project that provides dual purpose would receive preference for funding.

Bill Chapman agreed with Craig's comments that applicants who provide a project with both restoration/resource protection and public access should have a clear advantage.

Staff will provide a final report and public comments at the board meeting in March.

WWRP FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA

Kammie Bunes presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

After the first two grant cycles, the Farmland Preservation Advisory Committee, along with applicants, requested changes to make the evaluation instrument easier to use and ensure it assesses the appropriate elements in support of the overall intent of the program.

RCO staff recommends adoption of revisions to the evaluation instrument as outlined in Attachment A, *Farmland Preservation Program Evaluation Criteria*. The revisions include:

1. Expanding the elements considered in the *Agricultural Values* criteria to minimize bias against rangeland projects.
2. Consolidating the *Threat* and *Urgency* elements to reduce confusion and redundancy.
3. Adding questions under the *Environmental Values* criteria to help clarify intent.
4. Increasing the maximum points given for the *Community Values* question.
5. Establishing a formula for awarding points under the *Term* element, which considers the length of time the farmland is protected through acquiring or leasing development rights, and increasing the maximum number of points available.

Board discussion:

Chair Ogden hopes that in the future the board will look at small forest protection and viability issues.

Larry would like to have a discussion, at some point, about the appropriateness of the board using the "power of the purse" to push for sustainable, or green, projects.

Jeff would like to see the perpetual easement given more weight, perhaps one extra point for five additional years.

Craig commented that the board needs to be very clear on what goals they are seeking to achieve with the evaluation instruments. If the goal is to protect farmland or promote more sustainable practices, the actions should match the goals.

Bill Chapman **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-04 approving the proposed changes to the Farmland Preservation Program Evaluation Criteria. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-04 **APPROVED** as presented.

WWRP MITIGATION BANKING POLICY ISSUES

Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #6 for details.)

Staff requests additional time to research possible options for mitigation banking proposals within the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program. Staff proposes the Board revisit this topic at the March board meeting. Proposed policy language governing revenue generation, evaluation criteria, and evaluation procedures will be drafted and sent out for public review prior to the meeting.

Staff has continued to work on developing new alternatives for addressing the revenue generated from the sale of mitigation banking credits at WWRP assisted sites. Of primary concern are possible legal constraints on the sale of mitigation credits from WWRP-assisted sites, which are funded by state bonds. Staff is currently working with the Office of the State Treasurer and the Office of Financial Management to learn more about whether mitigation banking projects would be able to use WWRP funds to develop mitigation banks with the future intent of selling credits on the project. Until there are definitive answers it is difficult to pursue development of alternatives or evaluation procedures.

The pilot program is currently limited to the 2007-09 biennium. Staff recommends that the board take official action on the decision not to pursue a second special mitigation banking pilot program.

Leslie noted that, from public comments that were received last fall, option 2 was preferred – not to continue with the pilot program and to implement a supplemental review. A new option, to limit eligible projects to acquisition only, was also suggested.

Karen Daubert made a **MOTION** not to pursue a second pilot program. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Motion **APPROVED**.

WWRP STATE PARKS CATEGORY EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCESS

Marguerite Austin presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #7 for details.)

Staff requests board review of a proposal submitted by State Parks for evaluation of projects submitted to the State Parks category of WWRP. The proposal outlined in Attachment A was prepared by State Parks in anticipation of State Parks Commission adoption in January and submittal to the board for consideration and adoption in March

for the 2008 grant cycle. With direction from the board, State Parks and RCO staff will proceed with public review of the proposed criteria and process.

Board discussion:

Larry discussed State Parks' proposed process of project evaluation for this category. He noted the importance of having the commission and this board in agreement about the eligibility of proposed projects. He also noted that the commission has adopted a resolution toward becoming the nationwide leader in the State Parks system in being sustainable.

Chair Ogden asked Larry if the evaluation teams would be primarily State Parks staff members. Larry responded that, if at all possible, he would like to have stakeholders involved to make the process more transparent.

Marguerite noted that population proximity will need to be added to the list of proposed criteria. She would like the opportunity to work with staff to review and make modifications to the evaluation process as needed.

Bill Chapman would like to see the immediacy of threat, project design, and application of sustainability criteria raised from 5 to 10 points.

Staff will prepare a final recommendation for the board's consideration in March.

WWRP LOCAL PARKS CATEGORY COMBINATION PROJECTS

Staff recommended adoption of Option 2, which will require all applicants seeking funding for combination projects (a grant application that contains both land acquisition and development costs) in the Local Parks category of the WWRP to address both the acquisition and development criteria. (See notebook item #8 for details.)

Staff noted a wording change to Resolution #2008-05 as follows:

"NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the evaluation instrument for the Local Parks category be revised pursuant to Option 2 as shown in Table 2-in-memo-topic-#8".

There was no board discussion.

Steven Drew **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-05 as revised by staff. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-05 **APPROVED**.

WWRP PHASED PROJECTS

Kammie Bunes presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #10 for details.)

In November 2007, the board adopted a policy to give preference to WWRP projects that are later phases of a previously funded project. This preference will be given only when the project has scored equally with one or more non-phased projects. The board

was undecided about whether phased projects should also receive preference in the evaluation process.

The subcommittee, consisting of Jeff Parsons and Dave Brittell, recommends a more thorough exploration of the topic, with a report back to the board in November 2008. Other than the action taken at the November 2007 meeting, no changes for the 2008 grant cycle are proposed.

Jeff commented on implementing a strategic plan to be more proactive – to look into the future and assess the true demand as a way of building a case for kinds of appropriations that will be needed in the future. The phased approach is a good way to see where we want to end up in 10 years.

Chair Ogden noted that the board passed a policy in November that we would not give special preference unless there is a tie, in which case the phased project would get preference. We have a policy that will be in effect for the 2008 grant cycle.

Steve agrees with giving an incentive or protection for phased projects. He would be interested in joining the subcommittee.

WWRP STATE AGENCY MATCH

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #11 for details.)

The board proposes to adopt a policy allowing the board, at its fall WWRP decision-making meeting, to give preference to a project that has secured and certified a non-state match of \$2 million or greater between the time the project was evaluated and the fall meeting.

If the board adopts the above proposal, staff will update Manual #10b, *WWRP: Habitat Conservation Account and Riparian Protection Account: Policies and Project Selection* and send out notices to potential applicants and other interested parties. Any adopted changes will affect grant requests beginning with the 2008 grant cycle.

Jim pointed out three policy issues to consider that are embedded in the proposed paragraph:

- Match would apply to both state and local agencies
- Match is secured and certified
- RCFB grant is necessary for sponsor to receive the match

Karen voiced her support of the proposal, and hopes that it is clear that the board “may” give preference to a project that meets the criteria for match.

Jeff agrees with the proposal as it allows a process and justification for board action.

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-08. Larry Fairleigh **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-08 **APPROVED** as presented.

WWRP URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT ALLOCATION FORMULA AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #9 for details.)

Based on discussion at the November board meeting, staff proposed revisions to the WWRP Urban Wildlife Habitat category evaluation criteria and fund allocation process, with the intention of increasing the number of grant awards to local agencies. These changes to the Urban Wildlife Habitat category are being proposed for the 2008 grant cycle and include three revisions:

- 1) Dedicating a percentage of funds to local agency and state agency projects,
- 2) Revising the evaluation criteria scoring to award more points for projects that address the criteria specific to the Urban Wildlife Habitat category, and
- 3) Encouraging more participation from local agency representatives on the evaluation team.

This package of proposed changes to the Urban Wildlife Habitat category combines all the options previously presented to the public for comment in October, and specifies how the evaluation criteria weighting could be revised. The board sought comments on applying all these proposed changes as a package, both on increasing grant awards to local agency sponsors in this category and ensuring projects that provide habitat important to wildlife in proximity to metropolitan areas.

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-06. Bill Chapman **SECONDED**.

Board discussion:

Craig is concerned that the proposed changes in criteria moves away from important habitat quality projects and toward more public use. The original goal for this category was to shift more funds to local sponsors. He stressed that the subcommittee's recommendation of a 40-40 percentage split between local and state agencies without changing the criteria weighting, would have been more effective toward achieving this goal. He believes changing the criteria weighting will not have the intended consequence.

Karen commented that this category's main goal is to fund wildlife habitat closer to urban areas while providing educational values and inspiration for future generations. She observed that adding weight to the criteria would help get us closer to funding those projects that are in close proximity to metropolitan areas.

Jeff believes that the most important goal of this category is to bring habitat closer to people.

Bill favors the motion to adopt the resolution and pointed out that, if we find that this revision to the criteria does not get us closer to the intended goal, the issue can be revisited before the 2010 grant round.

Dave noted that, if the intent is to move quality habitat closer to cities, the public use criteria would be contrary to that goal. In order for WDFW projects to be competitive with DNR, they would each have to add public use which would be counter to their prioritized list of projects.

Craig Partridge **MOVED** to amend the motion by revising the scoring matrix for state agency applications to increase the maximum points from 5 to 10 for public benefit criteria and create a separate evaluation criteria for educational and scientific benefit. Larry Fairleigh **SECONDED**.

Chair Ogden asked staff to draft a revised resolution incorporating Craig's suggested changes and bring back later during the meeting for the board's consideration.

WWRP STATE LANDS CATEGORIES

Myra Barker presented this agenda item and provided background for this topic. (See notebook item #12 for details.)

RCO staff recommends adoption of an increase in the maximum grant request limits in the State Lands Development category only. The limit per site would be increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000 for multi-site projects, and an increase from \$250,000 to \$325,000 for single site projects.

Staff also recommends adoption of revisions to the evaluation instruments as outlined in Attachment A, State Lands Development Category Evaluation Criteria, and Attachment B, State Lands Restoration Category Evaluation Criteria.

Craig appreciates the intent and supports the recommended changes.

Karen Daubert **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-09. Dave Brittell **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-09 **APPROVED** as presented.

TOXINS IN SYNTHETIC TURF

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #13 for detailed report.)

Jim reported that staff has looked into concerns that have been raised over the use of synthetic turf in playfields, including investigation into the use of Polybrominated Diphenyl Ether (PBDE) flame retardants. Some reports of chemical analysis of artificial turf have shown that it is composed of a number of hazardous substances, but there is no specific evidence of PBDEs.

While it is beyond the scope of the RCFB to dictate standards or to serve as an environmental hearing body, there may be ways through evaluation criteria, funding incentives, and technical assistance that the board can foster more sound practices.

Staff recommends that the RCO investigate ways that the board could provide assistance and incentives to applicants to foster use of construction materials and practices that reduce potentially negative environmental and public health impacts.

Steve is concerned that manufacturers may not be forthcoming about whether the fire retardant used in artificial turf contains PBDEs. He suggested that RCO staff draft a letter requesting the Department of Ecology to do research on this issue. He wondered about the possibility of giving additional points to applicants that install PBDE free products.

Kaleen is concerned that this would put RCO in the mode of being a regulatory agency, which we are not. Perhaps we could add this topic to the workplan list, prioritize it and return to this issue at a later meeting.

RECOGNITION OF LAURA JOHNSON

Chair Ogden read a portion of Resolution #2008-07 recognizing former RCO Director, Laura Johnson, for 15 years of excellent service to the board and to all of the state's participants in outdoor recreation and conservation. In addition, the board extends its thanks and appreciation for her vision, dedication, integrity, skill, hard work, and leadership.

Jeff Parsons **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-07. Craig Partridge **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-07 **APPROVED**.

DRAFT BOATING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Jim Eychaner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #14 for details.)

SHB 1651, enacted during the 2007 legislative session, creates a boating activities program and calls for the RCO to conduct an initial study of recreational boater needs. RCO hired a contractor, Responsive Management, to conduct the study and to write an independent, objective report with recommendations. Staff has worked with a group of boaters and providers to develop early recommendations on management of the boating activities program.

Staff recommends that the board:

1. Accept the contractor's report and send it, with board comment, to the Legislature as an independent, objective study.
2. Review and provide guidance to RCO on recommendations regarding the "boating activities program".

Jim Eychaner presented an overview of the results of the boater needs assessment.

Public testimony:

Jim French, administrator of Statewide Recreation Program with State Parks, spoke in favor of the boater needs study. This program administers a statewide boating safety

program and mandatory boater education program. Washington has a higher boater fatality rate than most states due to insufficient education and law enforcement. Additional funds are needed to hire more law enforcement and to maintain and update a website to give boaters a greater level of electronic access to information. He is looking forward to the opportunity to compete for a portion of the remaining \$363,000.

Gerry Hodge is a data analyst for Tacoma School District, Washington Water Trails representative to the State Parks Boating Safety Advisory Council, a member of the National Recreational Trails Program (N RTP) Advisory Committee, and a member of a boater study group that originated SHB1651. Gerry noted that he recently submitted seven pages of concerns and comments about the boater needs survey. He is concerned by the recommendation that all boats be registered and believes results were biased as only six percent of non-motorized boaters were represented. Gerry also believes the sample size was biased toward motorized boats.

Larry asked Jim Eychaner whether the sample size was proportionally representative of the number of boats by type. Jim responded that Responsive Management states they weighted the sample size to make them in proportion to the number of registered boats by type of boat.

Steve asked whether enough contact was made to make the survey statistically accurate. Jim Eychaner noted that Responsive Management assured him that a significant number of people were contacted to make it weighted in proportion to size of user groups in order to make it statistically defensible.

Marina Hensch, director of government affairs at Northwest Marine Trade Association (NMTA), commented that she and Michael Campbell, NMTA president, have been very pleased with the study results. They attended the workshops and feel confident that the data was good and study completed in an accurate and defensible manner. She urged forming a boating activities advisory committee as quickly as possible as they have a lot of work to do. She recommends that the advisory committee be made up entirely of boaters to represent an accurate cross-section of the boating population. To keep the committee more independent, she would advise not including service providers as members.

Chair Ogden noted that the board would be accepting the report as an independent, objective study. The board also needs to approve the cover letter that will go with the report to the Legislature.

Jeff Parsons **MOVED** to accept the Washington Boater Needs Assessment report to be presented to the Legislature with the proposed transmittal letter. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Bill noted that the transmittal letter has strong language about the board's endorsement of the report. As this is the board's first look at the report and they have not had time to read it, he would not be comfortable giving his recommendation regarding its fairness and objectivity.

Jeff concurred with Bill's concerns about not having been given a chance to read the report before giving it his endorsement.

Steven would like to add "removal of creosote pilings" to the list of environmental issues to be addressed.

Staff will remove the endorsement language from the letter and leave the sentence that reads "RCFB has accepted the Responsive Management report" and also add "removal of creosote treated pilings" to the paragraph concerning environmental issues.

MOTION APPROVED AS AMENDED.

Boating Activities Program

Jim reported on some of the outcomes from the January 3rd boater workshop.

Attendees discussed the following policy issues:

- Overall management of the boating activities program
- Composition of the advisory committee mandated in SHB 1651
- Priorities for the new grant program
- Use of current-year funds from SHB 1651

Kaleen stated that this topic needs board feedback only and will be brought back in March for ratification.

Steve noted that if we are creating this advisory committee or giving a recommendation on the basis of who the boater user group represents, this is an important issue and the board needs more detail and thought.

Jeff asked about the money left over for the boating activities program after paying for the report and after giving 80 percent to State Parks for their safety education law enforcement program.

Jim Fox noted that the parameters in SHB 1651 for how to spend the funds are quite broad as long as it goes toward anything that supports recreational boating.

Larry Fairleigh made a **MOTION** to approve the use of up to \$10,000 from the Boating Activities Account for the Recreation and Conservation Office to contract with a facilitator to assist the RCO, State Parks, DNR, and WDFW in developing recommendations for improving the coordination of their boating and boating-related programs. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

The Chair noted that Representative Bill Fromhold (who sponsored SHB 1651) is interested in issues of boating safety and education and would welcome the effort of these groups working together.

Craig and Dave both spoke in support of the motion.

MOTION APPROVED.

URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT POLICY ISSUES – Continued

Marguerite Austin presented the amended Resolution #2008-06 based on the earlier discussion, including Attachment A with the revised evaluation criteria point values.

Marguerite explained the two sets of scoring criteria, one for local and one for state. For local agencies, the maximum points were increased from 5 to 10 each for public benefit, public use, and the population proximity criteria. The educational and scientific value question was removed from the public use criteria to become a stand-alone question worth 5 points. For state agencies, the maximum points were increased from 5 to 10 for the public benefit and population criteria. Each project's evaluation score would be normalized to the total point score when allocating the 20 percent "competitive" funds.

Craig believes this is a reasonable compromise to this issue and encourages support from the other members.

Jeff believes the revisions would compromise the statute's intent for educational and scientific value so will be voting against the amendment.

Chair Ogden commented that the subcommittee worked very hard to come up with the recommendation so she will be voting against the motion to adopt the revised resolution.

Revised Resolution #2008-06

Craig Partridge, Dave Brittell, and Steven Drew voted in **FAVOR OF THE MOTION**.

Larry Fairleigh, Karen Daubert, Jeff Parsons, Bill Chapman, and Chair Ogden voted in **OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION**

The motion to adopt Revised Resolution #2008-06 **FAILED**.

Original Resolution #2008-06

Larry Fairleigh, Karen Daubert, Jeff Parsons, Bill Chapman, and Chair Ogden voted in **FAVOR OF THE MOTION** to adopt the original Resolution #2008-06. Craig Partridge, Dave Brittell, and Steven Drew voted in **OPPOSITION OF THE MOTION**.

Original Resolution #2008-06 **APPROVED** as presented.

BERK REPORT ON RCO'S GRANT PROCESSES

Rachael Langen presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #16 for details.)

Rachael introduced Pia Franzese and Heather Rogers, from Berk and Associates, who were contracted by RCO to examine the reasons for the rate of un-timeliness in completing grant projects as scheduled, requiring reappropriations from the Legislature. A draft report will be available for staff review in late January. The final report is due to RCO in mid-February.

Pia provided an overview of the project. She reported that more than 85 percent of outside stakeholders interviewed said that RCO was the best, or one of the best, grant agencies to work with. When considering factors leading to project delay, one of the most frequent was insufficient staff time to manage the projects. Other factors were not enough time to effectively scope the project, unexpected delays in starting a project, slow internal processes, staff attrition, accessibility requirements, and permit requirements. During internal interviews, every grant manager expressed concern over workload and not having time for nurturing and growing proposals into successful grant projects.

Heather reported that in their research, Berk found that over the last five biennia, RCO's reappropriation level has been growing by 20 percent per biennium. Of RCO's administered grant programs, WWRP has the largest number of reappropriations at 38 percent. WWRP also accounts for 33 percent of the total capital budget.

Bill noted that since 1991-92, WWRP funding has increased with no added staffing for agencies. Looking at the ratio of employees to dollars, it is obvious that staffing has not kept up with grant appropriations.

Kaleen has met with the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and reported that they would like to see steps that we're taking to make a pronounced difference in the level of reappropriation, but they did not give a target number or percentage that we need to reach. Kaleen will be working with Nancy Stevenson, former financial manager at Ecology and a temporary employee at RCO, on performance measures. The agency intends to use the Governor's Government Management and Accountability Program (GMAP) as a tool to measure its success in reducing re-appropriations.

Kaleen will meet with the chairs of the RCFB and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) to outline a strategy for briefings, discussions and, if warranted, policy changes. Legislative staff and staff from OFM will also be briefed.

STATE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

Jim Eychaner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #15 for details.)

In order to be eligible to receive Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants, the state must submit a State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) to the National Park Service. The current SCORP expires in June 2008.

At a minimum, staff recommends submitting a tightly focused new SCORP document to the National Park Service to continue the state's eligibility for Land and Water funding. The deadline for submittal of this document is June 2008. Jim Eychaner is working on this document and hopes to have a draft for the board in March.

Additionally, staff seeks advice on whether to begin taking steps to develop a state strategic plan for the acquisition, renovation, and development of recreational resources and the preservation and conservation of open space envisioned by RCW 79A.25.020.

Kaleen commented that she envisions an overarching strategic plan that would include contributions from DNR, State Parks, the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, and others. They could possibly just do the bare minimum SCORP to remain eligible for Land and Water funds. She would like to discuss the extent the board wishes to be involved in either approach.

Karen feels it would be a valuable approach and money well spent to develop a more comprehensive planning document.

Steve would be interested in a focus on combining trends. He supports the concept of a broader study.

Craig noted that this body has an opportunity to knit together a strategic plan.

Chair Ogden observed that there appears to be consensus from the board on both documents.

Jim Eychaner will work on developing an outline for the board to preview.

NOVA FUND ALLOCATION POLICY

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #17 for details.)

Jim discussed how the board appointed a subcommittee, consisting of Jeff Parsons and Steven Drew, to look into Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program fund allocation policies. The subcommittee identified five issues:

- (a) Co-mingling fuel tax and ORV permit fee dollars
The subcommittee recommends that the current policy of awarding fuel tax dollars to projects in the ORV category before awarding permit fees be retained.
- (b) Allocation of competitive dollars
The subcommittee recommends that the competitive dollars be allocated after rather than before awarding the permit dollars. The subcommittee also recommends expanding the criteria for awarding competitive dollars.
- (c) "Returned" funds from a previous grant cycle
The subcommittee recommends retaining the current process of applying returned funds to the next ranked viable alternate in the same category.
- (d) Allocation of excess funds
If there are an insufficient number of projects to utilize all of the funds in one or more of the *NOVA Recreation* categories, the subcommittee recommends that gas tax funds not be carried forward to the next grant cycle, but rather awarded to projects in other *NOVA Recreation* categories where there are still partly-funded or unfunded projects.
- (e) Distribution of funds between the first and second grant cycles of the biennium.
The subcommittee recommends that the board consider awarding 60% to 70% of the *NOVA Recreation* funds in the first year.

Jim remarked that, while the current NOVA fund allocation process is within the current statutory and best management practices, the subcommittee's recommendations may help solve some inequity issues.

Kaleen suggested staff schedule a meeting with the NOVA advisory committee to get their reaction to the subcommittee's proposals.

Board consensus was for staff to circulate the recommendations for stakeholder review and comment, and transmit the results to the board for action at the March meeting.

POLICY FOR EXPENDING UNCOMMITTED FUNDS

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #18 for details.)

Jim discussed how, in most years, it has been a challenge to meet the National Recreational Trails Program's (NRTP) minimum fund allocation requirements in the program's two motorized categories. Typically, this is due to the few motorized requests received. Because of federal restrictions, unobligated funds cannot be shifted to categories with unfunded projects.

Staff recommends taking the following proposal out for public comment: when there are unobligated funds in one or more NRTP categories, the next highest scoring partially-funded or unfunded project may be moved by the board to the category with excess funds if the project is eligible to be placed in that category. The process would be repeated until funds are exhausted or there are no more unfunded projects eligible for moving.

Chair Ogden noted that it would be helpful if staff came back in March with a hypothetical example of what effect this would have on funds.

RCO WORK PLAN FOR 2008

Kaleen Cottingham presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #19 for details.)

With the help of the RCO's Operations Management team, Kaleen prepared a draft work plan for 2008. The plan articulates what's important and expected for the RCO to accomplish in 2008. The priorities set forth in this draft work plan are from the RCO's and RCFB's strategic plans, from directives from the governor, and from comments made by the board.

The draft plan lists 15 "Expected Work Results" and associated "Performance Targets" along with other pertinent information. The plan is used each week in management staff meetings and will also be used to help track and meet deadlines.

Craig referred to #14 "Increase outreach, advocacy, and partnerships by implementing communication plan" and commented that he doesn't think increase will occur to the level the board wanted with only change in the communications plan.

Kaleen responded that she has spent time reaching out to many to advertise strongly for our next grant round, especially to those who are not aware of our agency.

Steve commented on the impressive list and what a great job Kaleen is doing.

Chair Ogden asked Kaleen to give an update on the work plan at each board meeting.

LOCATIONS FOR MEETINGS IN 2008

Kaleen Cottingham presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #20 for details.)

Meeting dates are currently scheduled as follows:

March 27-28	Olympia
June 19-20	Travel
September 25-26	Travel
November 20-21	Olympia

Board members prefer traveling to the Bremerton area for the June meeting and the Methow or Walla Walla area in September. Staff will begin working to see if facilities are available in those locations.

Larry noted that there is a conflict with the September 25-26 meeting dates as that is when the State Parks Commission meets. Kaleen will try to find alternate dates for the September meeting that will work for all members of the board.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Approved by:

Val Ogden
Val Ogden, Chair

March 27, 2008
Date

Next meeting: March 27 & 28, 2008
 Olympia

Note added March 13, 2008: Following the meeting, the Director resolved the September meeting conflict by moving the meeting to September 23-24, 2008.

RESOLUTION #2008-01
January 2008

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following January 2008 item is approved:

- a) Approval of the last meeting of the RCO Minutes – November 1&2, 2007

Moved by: Craig Partridge

Seconded by: Bill Chapman

Adopted / Defeated / Deferred (underline results)

Date: January 15, 2008

RESOLUTION #2008-02
Time Extensions

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) adopted a project progress policy to address project terms, project progress, project extensions and project termination, and

WHEREAS, adopted policy requires Board review of all requests for time extensions that extend longer than the original four years, and

WHEREAS, three requests have been submitted for projects needing additional time beyond the four-year period, and

WHEREAS, the Board has reviewed the circumstances surrounding these extension requests; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution furthers the Recreation and Conservation Office 2007-2011 Strategic Plan goal of achieving a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to the Office (Goal 1);

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board hereby approves the time extension requests for the projects listed in Time Extension Request for Board Approval Attachment A – January 2008, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director be authorized to execute any and all amendments necessary to facilitate implementation of extensions for each of these project agreements.

Resolution moved by: Larry Fairleigh

Resolution seconded by: Dave Brittell

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: January 15, 2008

Attachment A
Time Extension Requests for Board Approval – January 2008
Resolution #2008-02

PROJECT #	SPONSOR NAME	PROJECT NAME	GRANT PROGRAM	DATE BOARD FUNDED	EXTENSION REQUESTED	Circumstance or reasons for delay
02-1101A	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Dungeness River Match	Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program – Critical Habitat	07/11/2003	06/30/2008	<p>This proposal was for acquisition of nearly 400 acres of riparian corridor as part of a multiple partner effort to protect and restore Dungeness River riparian habitat. Two of the original target properties were successfully acquired for a total of 13.97 acres within the original completion date of 11/30/05. Acquisition of the remaining original properties was unsuccessful.</p> <p>The Department of Fish and Wildlife identified a new target property in early 2007 which was approved as a scope amendment by the Recreation and Conservation Office. The scope amendment also included a time extension to 6/30/07. Fish and Wildlife requested a second time extension to 12/31/07 due to lengthy negotiations with the property owner. The second time extension was approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board at its June 2007 meeting (Resolution #2007-15). This time extension was approved under the condition an option agreement be secured by 12/31/07.</p> <p>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife is requesting a third time extension to complete the acquisition of the amended target property. The appraisal work is complete; however, no option agreement has yet been signed by the property owner. This project receives matching funds from the US Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>Fish and Wildlife has also requested a reduction in the grant amount from \$1,227,862 to \$457,826 as no other target properties are viable at this time. If the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board approves the third time extension, staff will process the scope reduction request. If not approved, staff will request a final bill and close the project. Funds will then be redistributed to an eligible alternate(s). Reimbursement requests have been submitted for 5% of the grant amount.</p>

PROJECT #	SPONSOR NAME	PROJECT NAME	GRANT PROGRAM	DATE BOARD FUNDED	EXTENSION REQUESTED	Circumstance or reasons for delay
02-1109C	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Western Pond Turtle Phase 3	Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program – Critical Habitat	07/11/2003	06/30/2008	<p>The objective of this project was to acquire 42 acres of critical habitat for the western pond turtle, a Washington state endangered species. The property was successfully acquired with one time extension through 6/30/2006.</p> <p>With funds remaining, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife requested and received approval for a scope change to include meadow and wetland enhancements to the recently acquired properties. Subsequently, Fish and Wildlife requested and received a second time extension to complete the habitat enhancement work.</p> <p>A second scope expansion and third time extension was requested and approved by the Recreation and Conservation Office to add an additional property acquisition to the project. Within this extended timeframe, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife secured an option to purchase the property.</p> <p>The Department of Fish and Wildlife is requesting a fourth time extension to complete acquisition of the amended target property. The transaction will require a boundary line adjustment with Klickitat County and approval from the Columbia River Gorge Commission. Reimbursement requests have been submitted for 72% of the grant amount.</p>

02-1047C	Town of Winthrop	Winthrop Community Park and Ice Rink	Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program – Local Parks	07/11/2003	07/31/2008.	<p>This project involved implementation of two long-term priorities for the Town of Winthrop – acquisition of new park land and construction of a permanent ice rink and outdoor sports court. Winthrop requested and received approval for scope modifications to include costs for site preparation, utilities, and a cover for the ice rink. Substantial progress has been made towards completion of the project. The property was acquired, construction of the ice rink has been completed, and all except for the interior work is finished at the restroom/storage building. The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board granted a six-month time extension at the June 2007 meeting.</p> <p>Early winter conditions has halted work on the parking area, accessible pathway, and landscaping. A cadre of volunteers worked nearly non-stop to get this project completed by December 31. However, with the onset of winter, the project was not completed. While the Town plans to open the ice rink for public use this winter, this extension would allow completion of the remaining support elements required per program policies.</p> <p>Reimbursement requests have been submitted for 66% of the grant amount.</p>
----------	------------------	--------------------------------------	--	------------	-------------	---

RESOLUTION #2008-04
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Farmland Preservation Program Evaluation Instrument Revisions

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW established the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW authorizes the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) to adopt policies and rules for WWRP; and

WHEREAS, the RCFB desires to incorporate a change to the WWRP policy manual regarding the evaluation instrument for the Farmland Preservation Program; and

WHEREAS, the proposed revisions have been made available for review and comment by individuals and organizations that have expressed an interest in WWRP; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution furthers the Recreation and Conservation Office's 2007-2011 Strategic Plan objective to provide leadership through policy development by considering new and updated policy recommendations (Goal 1, Strategy 1.1); and

WHEREAS, final adoption of this policy revision will be incorporated into Manual 10f: *WWRP: Farmland Preservation Program: Policies and Project Selection*;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the evaluation instrument for the Farmland Preservation Program be revised as shown on Attachment A of memo topic #5, dated December 19, 2007; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that RCO staff is directed to take the necessary steps for implementation of these revisions beginning with the 2008 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Bill Chapman

Resolution seconded by: Karen Daubert

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: January 15, 2008

**Attachment A
Farmland Preservation Program
Evaluation Criteria Summary Table**

Proposed deletions are shown as ~~strikeouts~~ and additions are underlined.

Criteria	Points
<p>Agricultural Values</p> <p>Importance: Soil types; suitability for producing agricultural products; size; economic productivity; fit of the project to local priorities</p> <p>Viability: On-site production and support facilities; farm to market access; proximity to roads and utilities (<u>croplands only</u>); <u>carrying capacity (rangelands only)</u>; water availability; drainage; presence of other features that could hinder or restrict use for agriculture; zoning; likelihood that the farm will remain in agriculture; <u>immediacy of threat to conversion to non-agricultural uses</u>; likelihood that the region will continue to support agriculture</p>	68
<p>Environmental Values (Acquisition only projects)</p> <p>Recommended as part of a plan or strategy; benefits to salmonids, migratory birds, other fish and wildlife habitat; integration with recovery efforts for endangered, threatened, or sensitive species; existing or proposed environmental management/stewardship plan</p>	22
OR	
<p>Environmental Values (Combination acquisition and restoration projects)</p> <p>Enhancement or restoration projects must further ecological functions: Consider the benefits to fish and wildlife species, especially endangered, threatened or sensitive species; benefits to habitat forming processes</p> <p>Consider the likelihood that the anticipated benefits will be realized: Project is based on accepted methods; project is likely to achieve the anticipated benefits</p> <p>Recommended as part of a plan or strategy</p>	22
<p>Community Values and Priorities</p> <p>Community support for the project; consistency with a local land use or a regional or statewide recreational or resource plan</p> <p>Other community values: Viewshed; aquifer recharge; occasional or periodic collector for storm water runoff; floods; agricultural sector job creation; educational and curriculum potential; historic value; buffer to public lands, <u>demonstration</u></p>	8 <u>12</u>
<p>Other</p> <p><u>Urgency</u>; Term; cost benefit; local match; sponsor's ability to acquire, manage, monitor, and enforce conservation easements; demonstration</p>	27 <u>31</u>
<p>Total points available</p>	125 <u>133</u>

REVISED RESOLUTION #2008-05
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Outdoor Recreation Account Local Parks Category
Evaluation Instrument Revision

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW established the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW authorizes the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) to adopt policies and rules for WWRP; and

WHEREAS, the RCFB desires to incorporate a change to the WWRP policy manual regarding the evaluation instrument for the Local Parks category; and

WHEREAS, the proposed revision has been made available for review and comment by individuals and organizations that have expressed an interest in WWRP; and

WHEREAS, final adoption of this policy revision will be incorporated into Manual 10a: *WWRP: Outdoor Recreation Account: Policies and Project Selection*; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution furthers the RCO 2007-2011 Strategic Plan objective to provide leadership through policy development by considering new and updated policy recommendations (Goal 1, Strategy 1.1);

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the evaluation instrument for the Local Parks category be revised pursuant to Option 2 as shown in Table 2; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that RCO staff is directed to take the necessary steps for implementation of these revisions beginning with the 2008 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Steven Drew

Resolution seconded by: Jeff Parsons

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: January 15, 2008

**Table 2 – Proposed Evaluation Criteria
Local Parks Category**

Local Parks provide property or facilities for active or passive outdoor recreation. They may contain both upland and water oriented elements, although their primary focus is on uplands and/or swimming pools. RCO Manual 10a.

WWRP – Local Parks Evaluation Questions and Scores									
Score	#	Question	Evaluators Score 0-5 Points	Acquisition Projects		Development Projects		Combination Projects	
				Multiplier	Maximum Total Points	Multiplier	Maximum Total Points	Multiplier	Maximum Total Points
Team	1	Public Need	5	3	15.0	3	15.0	3	15.0
Team	2	Project Scope	5	3	15.0	3	15.0	3	15.0
Team	3	Project Design	5	NA	NA	3	15.0	<u>1.5</u>	<u>7.5</u>
Team	4	Immediacy of Threat	5	2	10.0	NA	NA	<u>1</u>	<u>5.0</u>
Team	5	Site Suitability	5	1	5.0	NA	NA	<u>.5</u>	<u>2.5</u>
Team	6	Expansion/Renovation	5	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0
Team	7	Project Support	5	2	10.0	2	10.0	2	10.0
Team	8	Cost Efficiencies	5	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	5.0
RCO Staff	9	GMA Preference	0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	0.0
RCO Staff	10	Population Proximity	3	1	3.0	1	3.0	1	3.0
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE					68.0			68.0	68.0

KEY: RCO Staff = Criteria scored by *RCO staff*; Team = Criteria scored by interdisciplinary evaluation *team*

RESOLUTION #2008-06
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Urban Wildlife Habitat Category Revisions

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW established the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) and authorized the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) to adopt policies and rules for WWRP; and

WHEREAS, the RCFB has determined that there is inequity between the funds awarded to local agencies and to state agencies in the Urban Wildlife Habitat category of the Habitat Conservation Account; and

WHEREAS, the RCFB desires to incorporate a change to the WWRP policy manual regarding fund allocation in the Urban Wildlife Habitat category in order to increase grant awards to local agency sponsors and ensure projects also provide habitat important to wildlife in proximity to metropolitan areas; and

WHEREAS, the proposed policy has been made available for review and comment by individuals and organizations that have expressed an interest in WWRP; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution furthers the RCO 2007-2011 Strategic Plan objective to provide leadership through policy development by considering new and updated policy recommendations (Goal 1, Strategy 1.1); and

WHEREAS, final adoption of this policy revision will be incorporated into Manual 10b: *WWRP: Habitat Protection Account and Riparian Protection Account: Policies and Project Selection*

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the RCFB hereby adopts the following funding allocation formula for the Urban Wildlife Habitat category: forty percent of the funds for local agencies, forty percent of the funds for state agencies, and the remaining twenty percent of the funds will be distributed as follows: fully fund partially funded local agency projects, then fully fund partially funded state agency projects, and finally apply any remaining funds to the next highest ranked project(s), regardless of sponsor. Funds remaining, due to an insufficient number of applications by either local agency or state agency sponsors, will be awarded to the next highest ranked project(s) regardless of sponsor; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the RCFB hereby directs Recreation and Conservation Office staff to solicit for additional local agency representation on the Urban Wildlife Habitat category evaluation team; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the RCFB hereby revises the scoring matrix for the evaluation instrument to increase the maximum points from 5 to 10 the for public benefit, public use and population criteria; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the RCFB hereby further revises the evaluation criteria related to public use and creates a separate evaluation criteria for environmental and

scientific benefit as presented in Attachment A. This revision removes the educational and scientific evaluation question from the public use criteria and provides for 5 points for educational and scientific value.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Recreation and Conservation Office staff is directed to take the necessary steps for implementation of this revision beginning with the 2008 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Karen Daubert

Resolution seconded by: Bill Chapman

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: January 15, 2008

Attachment A
Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program
Evaluation Criteria
Urban Wildlife Habitat Category
(State & Local Agencies)

“Urban Wildlife Habitat means lands that provide habitat important to wildlife in proximity to a metropolitan area.” RCW 79A.15.010

WWRP - URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT EVALUATION SUMMARY		
Criteria	Evaluation Elements	Possible Points
Project Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate the project on statewide, vicinity, and site maps • Brief summary of the project [goal(s) and objective(s) statement] 	Not scored
Ecological and Biological Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The bigger picture • Uniqueness/significance of the site • Fish and wildlife species and or communities • Quality of Habitat 	20
Species and Communities with Special Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat to species/communities • Importance of acquisitions • Ecological roles • Taxonomic distinctness • Rarity 	10
Manageability and Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediacy of threat to the site • Long-term viability • Enhancement of existing protected land • On-going stewardship 	15
Public Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project support • Educational and/or scientific value 	5 <u>10</u>
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational and/or scientific value 	5
Public Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for, and appropriate level of, public use 	5 <u>10</u>
GMA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GMA Planning Requirement 	0
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population of, and proximity to, the nearest urban area 	5 <u>10</u>
Total Points Possible		<u>80</u>

RESOLUTION #2008-07
**Recognizing Director Laura Johnson for Service to the Recreation and
Conservation Funding Board and the People of the State of Washington**

WHEREAS, from 1992 to September 2007, Laura Johnson served the State of Washington and the citizens of Washington as the Director of the Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) and subsequently the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO); and

WHEREAS, under Laura's leadership, the agency grew from a small but highly regarded grant-making office to an agency entrusted with hundreds of millions of dollars for conservation and outdoor recreation; and

WHEREAS, throughout this period of growth, Laura continued to build the agency's reputation as competent, efficient, effective, fair, and having the highest ethical standards; and

WHEREAS, Laura guided the distribution of more than \$1 billion in grants for more than 4,000 projects statewide, leveraging matching resources of more than \$680 million, for a combined investment of more than \$1.7 billion in making Washington a great place to live, work, and play; and

WHEREAS, during her time as Director, Laura's accomplishments include:

- Establishing six new grant programs
- Overseeing the establishment of the Governor's Monitoring Forum on Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health, Washington Biodiversity Council, and Washington Invasive Species Council
- Inspiring staff with an unwavering dedication to the agency's mission and empowering staff to fulfill that mission
- Developing numerous studies for the Legislature, such as the Public Lands Inventory and Off-Road Vehicle Noise Study
- Participating in national conservation and recreation issues, including hosting several national conferences
- Overseeing the agency name change and other operational changes that provide the foundation for the agency's work in the future; and

WHEREAS, Laura's vision led the agency into groundbreaking territory with the addition of an American with Disabilities Act resource used by the entire state to make facilities more accessible to all and with the addition of the PRISM computer system that serves, to this day, as a model for grant-making organizations; as well as other cutting edge online portals that opened government to citizens, and

WHEREAS, members of the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board wish to recognize Laura's excellent service to the Board and to all of the state's participants in outdoor recreation and conservation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that, on behalf of the citizens of Washington and in recognition of Laura Johnson's assistance to the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board, the Board extends its thanks and appreciation for her vision, dedication, integrity, skill, hard work, and leadership; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board wishes her well in her future endeavors.

Unanimously approved by the
RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD
Meeting at Olympia, Washington on January 15, 2008.

Val Ogdan, Chair

RESOLUTION #2008-08
WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM
Habitat Conservation Account
Preference for Match

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW established the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW authorizes the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) to adopt policies and rules for WWRP; and

WHEREAS, the RCFB desires to incorporate a change to the WWRP policy manual in order to give preference to projects seeking grants from the Habitat Conservation Account that provide exceptional non-state matching resources; and

WHEREAS, the proposed revision has been made available for review and comment by individuals and organizations that have expressed an interest in WWRP; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution furthers the RCO 2007-2011 Strategic Plan objective to provide leadership through policy development by considering new and updated policy recommendations (Goal 1, Strategy 1.1);

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the following language shall be added to Manual #10b, *WWRP: Habitat Conservation Account and Riparian Protection Account: Policies and Project Selection*:

The RCFB, at its fall WWRP decision-making meeting, may give a project preference for funding if between the time the project is evaluated and the fall meeting the sponsor secures and certifies a matching share of \$2 million or more in non-state funds and the matching share would be lost if the project did not receive the WWRP grant.

and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that RCO staff is directed to take the necessary steps for implementation of this revision beginning with the 2008 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Karen Daubert

Resolution seconded by: Larry Fairleigh

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: January 15, 2008

RESOLUTION #2008-09
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
State Lands Category Evaluation Instrument Revisions

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW established the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.15 RCW authorizes the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) to adopt policies and rules for WWRP; and

WHEREAS, the RCFB desires to incorporate a change to the WWRP policy manuals regarding the evaluation instruments for the State Lands categories; and

WHEREAS, the RCFB desires to incorporate a change to the WWRP policy manual regarding maximum grant limits for the State Lands Development category; and

WHEREAS, the proposed revisions have been made available for review and comment by individuals and organizations that have expressed an interest in WWRP; and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution furthers the Recreation and Conservation Office's 2007-2011 Strategic Plan objective to provide leadership through policy development by considering new and updated policy recommendations (Goal 1, Strategy 1.1); and

WHEREAS, final adoption of these policy revisions will be incorporated into Manuals #10a, WWRP Outdoor Recreation Account: *Policies and Project Selection*, and #10b, WWRP Habitat Conservation Account: *Policies and Project Selection*;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the evaluation instrument for the State Lands categories will be revised as shown on Attachments A and B of memo topic #12; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the maximum grant limit for the State Lands Development category is increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000 per site in the State Lands Development category for multi-site projects, and is increased from \$250,000 to \$325,000 for single site projects; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that RCO staff is directed to take the necessary steps for implementation of these revisions beginning with the 2008 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Karen Daubert

Resolution seconded by: Dave Brittell

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: January 15, 2008

Attachment A

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program Evaluation Criteria

State Lands Development and Renovation Category

This project category is reserved for the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources for development and/or renovation of state recreation lands.

IAC Manual 10.

WWRP - State Lands Development and Renovation Criteria Analysis					
Score	#	Title	Type	Points	Focus
Team	1	Public Need	D	15 <u>20</u>	State
Team	2	Site Suitability and Design	D	15	Technical
Team	3	Diversity and Compatibility	D	10	State
Team	4	Plan Priority <i>(points moved to #1)</i>	D	5	State
Team	5 <u>4</u>	Performance Measure	D	5	State
Team	6 <u>5</u>	Public Benefit	D	5	State
IAC Staff	7 <u>6</u>	Population Proximity	D	1	State
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE = 56-					

KEY:

- IAC Score = Criteria *scored* by RCO staff
- Team = Criteria scored by interdisciplinary *team*
- D = Development and Renovation specific question
- Mult/Mx = Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
- Focus = *St/Loc/Tech*; Criteria orientation in accordance with SCORP policy of developing evaluation systems based on three need factors: those that meet general *statewide* needs (often called for in RCW or SCORP), those that meet *local* needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans), and those that meet *technical* considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Attachment B
Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program
Evaluation Criteria
 State Lands Restoration and Enhancement Category
 (WA Department of Fish and Wildlife & WA Department of Natural Resources)

“Restoration means bringing a site back to its original function through activities that can be reasonably expected to result in a site that is to the degree possible self sustaining; that is, the site will not require continual intervention to function as a predominately natural ecosystem. Enhancement improves the ecological functionality of a site.”

WWRP – STATE LANDS RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT EVALUATION SUMMARY			
Criteria Number	Criteria	Evaluation Elements	Possible Points
	Project Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate the project on statewide, vicinity, and site maps • Project narrative [goal(s) and objective(s)] 	Not scored
1	Ecological and Biological Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bigger picture • Uniqueness/significance of the site • Quality of habitat 	15
2	Need for Restoration or Enhancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated need for restoration/enhancement 	15
3	Long-Term Manageability and Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat to the site • Long-term viability • Enhancement of existing protected land 	10
4	Species and Communities with Special Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat to species/communities • Importance of restoration/enhancement • Ecological roles • Rarity 	5
5	Plan Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans • Prioritization efforts 	5
6	Public Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurable benefits • Educational and/or scientific value • Community support 	5
Total Points Possible			55