



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

May 17, 2007

TOPIC #6: Urban Wildlife Habitat Category

Prepared & Presented By: Leslie Ryan-Connelly, Grants Manager

Approved by the Director: 

Proposed Action: Information sharing and update

Summary:

The IAC Board Urban Wildlife Habitat subcommittee held a conference call in April 2007 to review staff analysis of the proposed alternatives to changing the Urban Wildlife Habitat category. The subcommittee has identified a preferred alternative and is ready to proceed with stakeholder and public review of the proposed alternatives.

Staff Recommendation:

Proceed with stakeholder and public review of the alternatives.

Background:

At the January IAC Board meeting, various alternatives were discussed regarding changes to the Urban Wildlife Habitat category with the goal to increase the award of grants to local agency sponsors. The board directed that three alternatives be forwarded for additional review listed below.

1. Dedicate a portion of the Urban Wildlife Habitat category funds to local and state agencies each.
2. Modify the evaluation instrument to give the urban-specific criteria additional weight.
3. Include more people with a local agency perspective on the Urban Wildlife Habitat evaluation team.

The board also discussed potential scenarios for implementing the first two alternatives. Staff was instructed to prepare alternatives analysis under the potential scenarios for Board Subcommittee review.



Attachment A describes the three alternatives being considered, example scenarios, and the staff analysis. Attachment B includes the data associated with the example scenarios.

Analysis:

Dedicating forty percent of funds to local agencies and sixty percent of funds to state agencies would have shifted approximately twelve percent of funds from state agencies to local agency sponsors over the last three funding cycles (2002, 2004, and 2006). This would have resulted in approximately \$2,146,773 additional funds to local agency sponsors.

Increasing the points awarded from five to ten for public use and population criteria would have had little impact toward awarding more funds to local agency sponsors. Over the three funding cycles considered, no additional local agency project would have been funded.

The Board Subcommittee preferred the first alternative over the second alternative which dedicates a portion of funds to local agencies and a portion of funds to state agencies. However, all three alternatives will be presented to the public for review and comment.

For the dedicated funds (first) alternative, the Subcommittee recommends three options be presented to the public for comment:

1. Forty percent of funds to local agencies and sixty percent of funds to state agencies
2. Fifty percent of funds to local agencies and fifty percent of funds to state agencies
3. Forty percent of funds to local agencies, forty percent of funds to state agencies, and twenty percent of funds competitive.

Staff proposes that the competitive funds under option 3 be distributed by the IAC Board first to fully fund partially funded projects based upon project rank and any remaining competitive funds be awarded to the next highest ranked project regardless of the sponsor type.

Next Steps:

The next step is to proceed with stakeholder involvement and public comment on the proposed changes. Staff will post the proposed changes on the IAC's internet page and send an email and postcard to interested parties. Public review and comment would occur during July 2007.

In addition, staff will convene a stakeholder group including at least one person from the following groups:

- o City
- o County
- o Environmental interest

- Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition
- State agency

Other potential members may include representatives from park districts, port districts, or Native American tribes. The stakeholder group would be convened for one meeting only to discuss the intended goal, the three proposed alternatives and various options, and potential results. The stakeholder group would meet during July 2007.

The results of the public comment and stakeholder participation would be shared with the Board at its September meeting. Draft program manual revisions would be presented at the November Board meeting.

Attachments:

- A – Alternatives, example scenarios, and staff analysis
- B – Example scenarios data
- C – Urban Wildlife Habitat evaluation instrument

Attachment A

Urban Wildlife Habitat Category Board Approved Alternatives for Consideration

4. Dedicate a percentage of the Urban Wildlife Habitat category funds to local and state agencies.
5. Modify the evaluation instrument to give the urban-specific criteria additional weight. Currently, the four specific criteria in the Urban Wildlife Habitat category identified in RCW 79A.15.060 (included as Attachment B) are:
 - a. Population of, and distance from, the nearest urban area;
 - b. Proximity to other wildlife habitat;
 - c. Potential for public use; and
 - d. Potential for use by special needs populations.
6. Include more people with a local agency perspective on the Urban Wildlife Habitat evaluation team. Currently the make-up of the evaluation team is individuals with expertise in various disciplines. Many of the same team members evaluate Critical Habitat, Natural Area Preserves, and Urban Wildlife Habitat categories.

Examples Considered

The attached spreadsheets demonstrate the first two alternatives above. The first three spreadsheets (Alternative 1 – 2006, 2004, 2002) show the impact of dedicating 40% of the category funding to local agency sponsors and 60% of the funding to state agency sponsors. The yellow highlighted projects are the changes to the funding awards. The revised funding list for 2004 is the list that was approved by the Legislature.

The next three spreadsheets (Alternative 2 – 2006, 2004, 2002) show the impact of increasing criteria #5: *Public Use* and criteria #7: *Population* from 5 to 10 points each. Scores were doubled for each project for these two criteria¹. New totals were calculated and the orders of the projects were re-ranked. The projects highlighted in yellow show which applications moved up or down the list under the new ranking.

Alternative 3 would not result in modification of current IAC policy. It is an administrative interpretive change that would be implemented during selection of evaluation team members.

¹ It was not possible to assign additional points to special needs populations since this criterion is currently embedded in criteria #5. There is no way to identify how many points may have been attributed to special needs versus other elements within criteria #5.

Staff Analysis

Under alternative 1 with dedication of a portion of funds to local agency sponsors, grant awards shift significantly in all three biennia considered. In 2006 and 2002, 3 local agency projects would receive funding. In 2004, one additional local agency received funding. This would result in a shift in funds from state to local agencies sponsors totaling \$2,146,773 over the three funding cycles or 12% of the total Urban Wildlife Habitat funds.

Under alternative 2 which provided additional weight to two of the evaluation criteria, there is less of a change in the ranked order of projects compared with alternative one. While projects shifted up or down the list one or two places, in only one case did a local agency sponsor move ahead of a state funded project. (King County's Issaquah Creek project on the 2004 list.) This project still would not have been funded as it still ranked lower on the list – moving from position seven to six.

Attachment B
Example Scenarios Data

**WWRP - Urban Wildlife Category 2006 Application Cycle
Alternative 1 - 40% Locals and 60% State Agencies
Shading shows change in grant awards from original funding.**

Revised Funding			Request	Funding Level
1	Antione Peaks	Spokane County	1,421,750	1,421,750
2	Woodard Bay	DNR	2,302,440	2,302,440
3	Stavis NRCA	DNR	3,222,555	1,887,960
6	Cougar Mountain	City of Issaquah	500,000	500,000
8	Longfellow Creek	City of Seattle	300,000	300,000
10	Auburn Environmental Park	City of Auburn	1,151,879	571,860
11	Tukes Mountain	City of Battle Ground	227,750	Alternate
12	Magnuson Park	City of Seattle	500,000	Alternate
			9,626,374	6,984,000
			Total funds shifted	1,334,595

Original Funding			Request	Funding Level
1	Antione Peaks	Spokane County	1,421,750	1,421,750
2	Woodard Bay	DNR	2,302,440	2,302,440
3	Stavis NRCA	DNR	3,222,555	3,222,555
6	Cougar Mountain	City of Issaquah	500,000	37,255
8	Longfellow Creek	City of Seattle	300,000	Alternate
10	Auburn Environmental Park	City of Auburn	1,151,879	Alternate
11	Tukes Mountain	City of Battle Ground	227,750	Alternate
12	Magnuson Park	City of Seattle	500,000	Alternate
			9,626,374	6,984,000

The revised funding is the scenario approved by the Legislature.

Projects moved to the Riparian Protection Account

4	Lower Union River	WDFW
5	Beaver Lake	City of Sammamish
7	Shell Creek	City of Edmonds
9	Puyallup River Setback Levee	Pierce County

WWRP - Urban Wildlife Category 2004 Application Cycle
Alternative 1 - 40% Locals and 60% State Agencies
Shading shows change in grant awards from original funding.

Revised Funding			Request	Funding Level
1	Stavis NRCA	DNR	2,669,703	2,669,703
2	Woodard Bay NRCA	DNR	1,540,267	930,297
3	Central Kistap	Kitsap County	755,902	755,902
4	Whipple Creek	Clark County	1,020,920	1,020,920
5	Nookachamps Creek	WDFW	1,838,000	Alternate
6	Icy Creek	WDFW	2,074,800	Alternate
7	West Tiger Mountain	DNR	1,830,885	Alternate
8	Vancouver Lowlands	WDFW	2,855,370	Alternate
9	Gazzam Lake Park	Bainbridge Island Parks	1,000,000	623,178
10	Lake Terrell	WDFW	606,690	Alternate
			16,192,537	6,000,000
			Total funds shifted	623,178

Original Funding			Request	Funding Level
1	Stavis NRCA	DNR	2,669,703	2,669,703
2	Woodard Bay NRCA	DNR	1,540,267	1,540,267
3	Central Kistap	Kitsap County	755,902	755,902
4	Whipple Creek	Clark County	1,020,920	1,020,920
5	Nookachamps Creek	WDFW	1,838,000	13,208
6	Icy Creek	WDFW	2,074,800	Alternate
7	West Tiger Mountain	DNR	1,830,885	Alternate
8	Vancouver Lowlands	WDFW	2,855,370	Alternate
9	Gazzam Lake Park	Bainbridge Island Parks	1,000,000	Alternate
10	Lake Terrell	WDFW	606,690	Alternate
			16,192,537	6,000,000

The revised funding is the scenario approved by the Legislature.

**WWRP - Urban Wildlife Category 2002 Application Cycle
Alternative 1 - 40% Locals and 60% State Agencies
Shading shows change in grant awards from original funding.**

Revised Funding			Request	Funding Level
1	Mt Si NRCA	DNR	3,195,700	2,835,000
2	Saltse Flats	WDFW	2,762,486	Alternate
3	Tahuya River	WDFW	1,046,850	Alternate
4	Woodard Bay	DNR	1,202,391	Alternate
5	West Tiger Mountain	DNR	1,144,000	Alternate
6	Lower Nooksack	WDFW	622,125	Alternate
7	Issaquah Creek	King County	445,925	445,925
8	Lost Continent of Illahe	Kitsap County	861,050	861,050
9	Beaver Lake	City of Sammamish	1,513,862	589,025
10	North Bend	City of North Bend	1,200,000	Alternate
11	Bear Creek Wetland	WDFW	3,292,537	Alternate
12	Juanita Woodland	City of Kirkland	995,550	Alternate
13	Woodway Reserve	City of Woodway	602,515	Alternate
			18,884,991	4,725,000
			Total funds shifted	1,890,000

Original Funding			Request	Funding Level
1	Mt Si NRCA	DNR	3,195,700	3,195,700
2	Saltse Flats	WDFW	2,762,486	1,529,300
3	Tahuya River	WDFW	1,046,850	Alternate
4	Woodard Bay	DNR	1,202,391	Alternate
5	West Tiger Mountain	DNR	1,144,000	Alternate
6	Lower Nooksack	WDFW	622,125	Alternate
7	Issaquah Creek	King County	445,925	Alternate
8	Lost Continent of Illahe	Kitsap County	861,050	Alternate
9	Beaver Lake	City of Sammamish	1,513,862	Alternate
10	North Bend	City of North Bend	1,200,000	Alternate
11	Bear Creek Wetland	WDFW	3,292,537	Alternate
12	Juanita Woodland	City of Kirkland	995,550	Alternate
13	Woodway Reserve	City of Woodway	602,515	Alternate
			18,884,991	4,725,000

WWRP - Urban Wildlife Category 2006 Application Cycle
Alternative 2 - double points for Public Use and Population
Shading shows change in rank order.

Original Rank	Revised Scores		Ecological	Species	Management	Public Benefit	Public Use X 2	GMA	Population X 2	Total
1	Antione Peaks	Spokane County	19.000	9.333	14.000	4.667	8.444	0.000	4.000	59.444
2	Woodard Bay	DNR	16.556	8.556	12.778	4.556	9.334	0.000	4.000	55.780
3	Stavis NRCA	DNR	16.889	8.222	11.778	3.889	6.000	0.000	8.000	54.778
4	Lower Union River	WDFW	15.889	8.333	11.333	4.000	6.888	0.000	3.000	49.443
5	Beaver Lake	City of Sammamish	11.667	5.333	10.111	3.222	6.444	0.000	8.000	44.777
6	Cougar Mountain	City of Issaquah	11.222	4.667	10.444	3.333	6.666	0.000	8.000	44.332
8	Longfellow Creek	City of Seattle	8.667	4.111	8.778	3.222	5.778	0.000	10.000	40.556
7	Shell Creek	City of Edmonds	9.111	4.111	10.222	3.222	6.000	0.000	6.000	38.666
	Puyallup River Setback									
9	Levee	Pierce County	11.000	7.111	7.556	2.333	3.112	0.000	6.000	37.112
10	Auburn Environmental Park	City of Auburn	7.000	3.889	7.000	3.444	6.666	0.000	8.000	35.999
12	Magnuson Park	City of Seattle	5.889	3.111	7.000	3.222	6.444	0.000	10.000	35.666
11	Tukes Mountain	City of Battle Ground	8.667	4.222	6.778	2.778	4.666	0.000	7.000	34.111

Original Rank	Original Scores		Ecological	Species	Management	Public Benefit	Public Use	GMA	Population	Total
1	Antione Peaks	Spokane County	19.000	9.333	14.000	4.667	4.222	0.000	2.000	53.222
2	Woodard Bay	DNR	16.556	8.556	12.778	4.556	4.667	0.000	2.000	49.113
3	Stavis NRCA	DNR	16.889	8.222	11.778	3.889	3.000	0.000	4.000	47.778
4	Lower Union River	WDFW	15.889	8.333	11.333	4.000	3.444	0.000	1.500	44.499
5	Beaver Lake	City of Sammamish	11.667	5.333	10.111	3.222	3.222	0.000	4.000	37.555
6	Cougar Mountain	City of Issaquah	11.222	4.667	10.444	3.333	3.333	0.000	4.000	36.999
7	Shell Creek	City of Edmonds	9.111	4.111	10.222	3.222	3.000	0.000	3.000	32.666
8	Longfellow Creek	City of Seattle	8.667	4.111	8.778	3.222	2.889	0.000	5.000	32.667
	Puyallup River Setback									
9	Levee	Pierce County	11.000	7.111	7.556	2.333	1.556	0.000	3.000	32.556
10	Auburn Environmental Park	City of Auburn	7.000	3.889	7.000	3.444	3.333	0.000	4.000	28.666
		City of Battle								
11	Tukes Mountain	Ground	8.667	4.222	6.778	2.778	2.333	0.000	3.500	28.278
12	Magnuson Park	City of Seattle	5.889	3.111	7.000	3.222	3.222	0.000	5.000	27.444

WWRP - Urban Wildlife Category 2004 Application Cycle
Alternative 2 - double points for Public Use and Population
Shading shows change in rank order.

Original Rank	Revised Scores		Ecological	Species	Management	Public Benefit	Public Use X 2	GMA	Population X 2	Total
1	Stavis NRCA	DNR	17.625	9.250	12.750	4.250	7.000	0.000	8.000	58.875
	Woodard Bay									
2	NRCA	DNR	15.375	9.000	11.125	4.250	8.250	0.000	4.000	52.000
3	Central Kistap	Kitsap County	13.625	6.375	11.250	3.500	6.500	0.000	8.000	49.250
4	Whipple Creek	Clark County	13.125	5.250	10.625	3.375	7.750	0.000	9.000	49.125
	Nookachamps									
5	Creek	WDFW	15.000	7.500	10.250	3.250	7.500	0.000	2.000	45.500
8	Vancouver Lowlands	WDFW	12.625	6.125	8.750	2.250	6.750	0.000	9.000	45.500
6	Icy Creek	WDFW	12.625	5.375	11.125	3.125	6.000	0.000	7.000	45.250
	West Tiger									
7	Mountain	DNR	11.500	5.000	11.375	3.375	6.000	0.000	7.000	44.750
	Bainbridge Island									
9	Gazzam Lake Park	Parks	11.500	4.750	9.000	3.125	5.750	0.000	8.000	42.125
10	Lake Terrell	WDFW	11.375	4.875	10.125	3.125	5.250	0.000	1.000	35.750

Original Rank	Original Scores		Ecological	Species	Management	Public Benefit	Public Use	GMA	Population	Total
1	Stavis NRCA	DNR	17.625	9.250	12.750	4.250	3.500	0.000	4.000	51.375
	Woodard Bay									
2	NRCA	DNR	15.375	9.000	11.125	4.250	4.125	0.000	2.000	45.875
3	Central Kistap	Kitsap County	13.625	6.375	11.250	3.500	3.250	0.000	4.000	42.000
4	Whipple Creek	Clark County	13.125	5.250	10.625	3.375	3.875	0.000	4.500	40.750
	Nookachamps									
5	Creek	WDFW	15.000	7.500	10.250	3.250	3.750	0.000	1.000	40.750
6	Icy Creek	WDFW	12.625	5.375	11.125	3.125	3.000	0.000	3.500	38.750
	West Tiger									
7	Mountain	DNR	11.500	5.000	11.375	3.875	3.000	0.000	3.500	38.250
	Vancouver									
8	Lowlands	WDFW	12.625	6.125	8.750	2.250	3.375	0.000	4.500	37.625
	Bainbridge Island									
9	Gazzam Lake Park	Parks	11.500	4.750	9.000	3.125	2.875	0.000	4.000	35.250
10	Lake Terrell	WDFW	11.375	4.875	10.125	3.125	2.625	0.000	0.500	32.625

WWRP - Urban Wildlife Category 2002 Application Cycle
Alternative 2 - double points for Public Use and Population
Shading shows change in rank order.

Original Rank	Revised Scores		Ecological	Species	Management	Public Benefit	Public Use X 2	GMA	Population X 2	Total
1	Mt Si NRCA	DNR	16.857	7.571	13.714	3.714	8.286	0.000	5.000	55.142
3	Tahuya River	WDFW	16.714	7.429	10.857	3.857	5.714	0.000	3.000	52.571
5	West Tiger Mountain Saltese Flasts Phase	DNR	13.714	6.143	12.714	3.429	3.000	0.000	3.000	52.000
2	2	WDFW	17.714	8.429	11.857	4.714	3.858	0.000	0.000	51.572
4	Woodard Bay	DNR	15.143	6.714	12.000	4.143	3.572	0.000	4.000	50.572
7	Issaquah Creek Lost Continent of Ilaha	King County	15.000	6.571	10.857	3.857	4.572	0.000	3.000	48.857
3	Ilaha	Kitsap County City of	14.429	6.857	10.714	3.714	4.572	0.000	3.000	48.286
9	Beaver Lake	Sammamish	13.857	6.857	8.857	3.714	6.858	0.000	3.000	48.143
6	Lower Nooksack	WDFW	15.714	7.714	11.429	4.000	4.572	0.000	3.000	46.429
10	North Bend	City of North Bend	13.000	5.857	11.286	3.429	6.000	0.000	5.000	44.572
11	Bear Creek Wetland	WDFW	10.571	5.143	8.286	3.143	8.858	0.000	8.000	44.001
12	Juanita Woodland	City of Kirkland	8.000	3.714	9.000	3.857	8.000	0.000	10.000	42.571
13	Woodway Reserve	City of Woodway	9.286	4.286	8.714	3.286	5.714	0.000	6.000	37.286

Original Rank	Original Scores		Ecological	Species	Management	Public Benefit	Public Use	GMA	Population	Total
1	Mt Si NRCA	DNR	16.857	7.571	13.714	3.714	4.143	0.000	2.500	48.499
	Saltese Flasts Phase									
2	2	WDFW	17.714	8.429	11.857	4.714	4.429	0.000	0.000	47.143
3	Tahuya River	WDFW	16.714	7.429	10.857	3.857	2.857	0.000	4.000	45.714
4	Woodard Bay	DNR	15.143	6.714	12.000	4.143	4.286	0.000	2.000	44.286
5	West Tiger Mountain	DNR	13.714	6.143	12.714	3.429	4.000	0.000	4.000	44.000
6	Lower Nooksack	WDFW	15.714	7.714	11.429	4.000	3.286	0.000	1.500	43.643
7	Issaquah Creek Lost Continent of Ilaha	King County	15.000	6.571	10.857	3.857	2.286	0.000	4.000	42.571
8	Ilaha	Kitsap County City of	14.429	6.857	10.714	3.714	2.286	0.000	4.000	42.000
9	Beaver Lake	Sammamish	13.857	6.857	8.857	3.714	3.429	0.000	4.000	40.714
10	North Bend	City of North Bend	13.000	5.857	11.286	3.429	3.000	0.000	2.500	39.072
11	Bear Creek Wetland	WDFW	10.571	5.143	8.286	3.143	4.429	0.000	4.000	35.572
12	Juanita Woodland	City of Kirkland	8.000	3.714	9.000	3.857	4.000	0.000	5.000	33.571
13	Woodway Reserve	City of Woodway	9.286	4.286	8.714	3.286	2.857	0.000	3.000	31.429

**Attachment C
Urban Wildlife Habitat Evaluation Instrument**

"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
Public Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for, and appropriate level of, public use 	5
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
Total Points Possible		60