



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE  
1111 Washington Street SE  
PO Box 40917  
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

January 29, 2007

**TOPIC #6: Urban Wildlife Habitat Category**

**Prepared By:** Leslie Ryan-Connelly

**Approved by the Director:** 

**Presented By:** Jim Fox and Leslie Ryan-Connelly

**Proposed Action:** Direction to the Board Subcommittee

**Summary:**

The IAC Urban Wildlife Habitat subcommittee held a conference call in December to discuss potential changes to the Urban Wildlife Habitat category and possible next steps. The subcommittee seeks direction from the Board on proceeding with changes to the Urban Wildlife Habitat category.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Provide direction to the subcommittee and IAC staff on which alternatives below are worthwhile to present to stakeholders and the public for review.

**Background:**

Since revisions to the Urban Wildlife Habitat evaluation criteria in 1994 and 1999, fewer grants have been awarded to local agencies. The IAC Board is interested in addressing this reduction in local agency funding and has been reviewing the category's history.

At the November 16, 2006, IAC meeting, a subcommittee was formed to develop specific recommendations regarding changes to the Urban Wildlife Habitat category for Board consideration and to begin conversations with stakeholders. Subcommittee members are Karen Daubert, Jeff Parsons, and Craig Partridge. Steven Drew is an alternate.

Two members of the subcommittee met via conference call December 18, 2006 and discussed various approaches to revising the Urban Wildlife Category. In particular, they discussed the three main alternatives identified at the November 2006 IAC Board meeting which were 1) revising the evaluation criteria and scoring system, 2) setting a limit on the maximum grant request, and 3) reserving a percentage of Urban Wildlife Habitat funds for state/local agencies and/or specific project types.



**Analysis:**

The subcommittee discussed the three options mentioned above as well as a fourth option to reserve a percentage of funds for distribution based upon the geographic distance of a project from an urban area. Overall, the subcommittee agreed the goal for any changes would be to increase the award of grants to local agencies without seriously compromising the quality of habitat protected, in keeping with legislative direction.

The subcommittee rejected the idea of setting a limit on the maximum grant request due to the fact that urban property is costly. Setting a cap could also limit the number of projects that would come forward.

Two alternatives emerged that the subcommittee would like the IAC Board to discuss and deliberate prior to initiating discussions with stakeholders and the public. The alternatives are listed below with pros and cons for each outlined in Attachment A.

1. Dedicate a percentage of the Urban Wildlife Habitat category funds in one of the following ways:
  - a. A portion each to local and state agencies; or
  - b. A portion to projects within a certain distance from an urban center.
2. 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.

The first criterion currently has a maximum of 5 of the total 60 points available. The second criterion is embedded within the evaluation question addressing management and viability (15 points). This evaluation question is the same for Critical Habitat and Natural Area Preserve categories. The third and fourth criteria regarding public use and special needs populations are combined together for a maximum of 5 points. The current evaluation instrument is included as Attachment C.

In addition to the two alternatives identified by the subcommittee, IAC staff has identified one other administrative option that the IAC Board may wish to consider.

3. 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.

**Next Steps:**

The subcommittee requests feedback from the IAC Board on the alternatives presented. The Board may wish to identify a preferred alternative. Based upon this discussion, the alternatives will be refined and/or amended for presentation to stakeholders and the public. Public review will take place before the June 7-8, 2007 IAC Board meeting.

At the June meeting, IAC Board can then discuss input from the public and proceed with any changes to the program. Final adoption of any changes needs to occur by the November 1-2, 2007 meeting in order to be ready for the 2008 grant cycle. See the proposed timeline in Attachment D.

**Attachments:**

- A - Pros and cons of alternatives identified.
- B - Urban Wildlife Habitat RCW criteria.
- C - Urban Wildlife Habitat evaluation instrument.
- D - Timeline.

**Attachment A  
Urban Wildlife Habitat Category  
Pros and Cons of Alternatives**

Alternative Number	Alternative	Pros	Cons
1a	Dedicate a portion of funds to local and a portion of funds to state agency projects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides certainty that local agency sponsors will receive a portion of the grant funds.</li> <li>• Approach taken by the legislature for the previous (2004) grant cycle (40% for local agency projects).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May award funds to lower ranked projects (i.e. inferior habitat value) in order to meet dedication level.</li> <li>• May discourage local agencies from partnering with state agencies, which is intended to avoid the match requirement.</li> <li>• No clear way to establish the percentages.</li> </ul>
1b	Dedicate a portion of funds to projects within a specific distance from an urban center.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides certainty that projects will be funded closer to an urban center.</li> <li>• Does not distinguish between types of sponsor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not guarantee a level of funding for local or state agencies (could also be viewed as a positive).</li> <li>• May award funds to lower ranked projects in order to meet dedication level.</li> <li>• Would need to define another level of geographic delineation in addition to the current eligibility criteria.</li> <li>• No clear way to establish the percentages.</li> </ul>

<b>Alternative Number</b>	<b>Alternative</b>	<b>Pros</b>	<b>Cons</b>
2	Provide more weight to the urban specific evaluation criteria.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• May result in funding more projects in areas with higher population density and/or special needs populations.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not guarantee a level of funding for local or state agencies (could also be viewed as a positive).</li><li>• Would need to balance with the habitat quality criteria.</li></ul>
3	Modify the UWH evaluation team to include more people with a local agency perspective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Create more of a balance between statewide experts and local experts.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does not guarantee a level of funding for local or state agencies (could also be viewed as a positive)</li></ul>

**Attachment B**  
**RCW 79A.15.060**

**RCW 79A.15.060, Habitat conservation account -- Acquisition policies and priorities. (Effective July 1, 2007.)**

(1) The committee may adopt rules establishing acquisition policies and priorities for distributions from the habitat conservation account.

(2) Except as provided in RCW 79A.15.030(7), moneys appropriated for this chapter may not be used by the committee to fund additional staff positions or other overhead expenses, or by a state, regional, or local agency to fund operation and maintenance of areas acquired under this chapter.

(3) Moneys appropriated for this chapter may be used by grant recipients for costs incidental to acquisition, including, but not limited to, surveying expenses, fencing, and signing.

(4) Moneys appropriated for this section may be used to fund mitigation banking projects involving the restoration, creation, enhancement, or preservation of critical habitat and urban wildlife habitat, provided that the parties seeking to use the mitigation bank meet the matching requirements of subsection (5) of this section. The moneys from this section may not be used to supplant an obligation of a state or local agency to provide mitigation. For the purposes of this section, a mitigation bank means a site or sites where critical habitat or urban wildlife habitat is restored, created, enhanced, or in exceptional circumstances, preserved expressly for the purpose of providing compensatory mitigation in advance of authorized project impacts to similar resources.

(5) The committee may not approve a local project where the local agency share is less than the amount to be awarded from the habitat conservation account.

(6) In determining acquisition priorities with respect to the habitat conservation account, the committee shall consider, at a minimum, the following criteria:

(a) For critical habitat and natural areas proposals:

(i) Community support for the project;

(ii) The project proposal's ongoing stewardship program that includes control of noxious weeds, detrimental invasive species, and that identifies the source of the funds from which the stewardship program will be funded;

(iii) Recommendations as part of a watershed plan or habitat conservation plan, or a coordinated region-wide prioritization effort, and for projects primarily intended to benefit salmon, limiting factors, or critical pathways analysis;

(iv) Immediacy of threat to the site;

(v) Uniqueness of the site;

(vi) Diversity of species using the site;

(vii) Quality of the habitat;

(viii) Long-term viability of the site;

(ix) Presence of endangered, threatened, or sensitive species;

(x) Enhancement of existing public property;

(xi) Consistency with a local land use plan, or a regional or state-wide recreational or resource plan, including projects that assist in the implementation of local shoreline master plans updated according to RCW 90.58.080 or local comprehensive plans updated according to RCW 36.70A.130;

(xii) Educational and scientific value of the site.

(xiii) Integration with recovery efforts for endangered, threatened, or sensitive species;

(xiv) For critical habitat proposals by local agencies, the statewide significance of the site.

(b) For urban wildlife habitat proposals, in addition to the criteria of (a) of this subsection:

(i) Population of, and distance from, the nearest urban area;

Topic #6: Urban Wildlife Habitat Category

January 29, 2007

Page 7

(ii) Proximity to other wildlife habitat;

(iii) Potential for public use; and

(iv) Potential for use by special needs populations.

(7) Before November 1st of each even-numbered year, the committee shall recommend to the governor a prioritized list of all state agency and local projects to be funded under RCW 79A.15.040(1) (a), (b), and (c). The governor may remove projects from the list recommended by the committee and shall submit this amended list in the capital budget request to the legislature. The list shall include, notes following RCW 79A.15.040.

but not be limited to, a description of each project and any particular match requirement, and describe for each project any anticipated restrictions upon recreational activities allowed prior to the project.

[2005 c 303 § 8; 2000 c 11 § 67; 1999 c 379 § 918; 1997 c 235 § 719; 1990 1st ex.s. c 14 § 7. Formerly RCW 43.98A.060.]

**NOTES: Effective date -- 2005 c 303 §§ 1-14:** See note following RCW 79A.15.010. **Effective date -- 1999 c 379:** See note following RCW 79A.15.040. **Severability -- Effective date-- 1997 c 235:** See

**Attachment C**  
**Urban Wildlife Habitat Evaluation Instrument**

<b>WWRP - Urban Wildlife Habitat Evaluation Summary</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Elements</b>	<b>Possible Points</b>
Project Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locate the project on statewide, vicinity, and site maps</li> <li>• Brief summary of the project [goal(s) and objective(s) statement]</li> </ul>	Not scored
Ecological and Biological Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bigger picture</li> <li>• Uniqueness/significance of the site</li> <li>• Fish and wildlife species and or communities</li> <li>• Quality of Habitat</li> </ul>	20
Species and Communities with Special Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Threat to species/communities</li> <li>• Importance of acquisitions</li> <li>• Ecological roles</li> <li>• Taxonomic distinctness</li> <li>• Rarity</li> </ul>	10
Manageability and Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Immediacy of threat to the site</li> <li>• Long-term viability</li> <li>• Enhancement of existing protected land</li> <li>• On-going stewardship</li> </ul>	15
Public Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project support</li> <li>• Educational and/or scientific value</li> </ul>	5
Public Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for, and appropriate level of, public use</li> </ul>	5
GMA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GMA Planning Requirement</li> </ul>	0
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population of, and proximity to, the nearest urban area</li> </ul>	5
<b>Total Points Possible</b>		<b>60</b>



## WWRP Scoring Criteria Urban Wildlife Habitat Category

### 1. Ecological/Biological characteristics. Why is the site worthy of long-term conservation?

RCW 79A.15.060 (6)(a)(iii, v - vii, xi); (6)(b)(ii)

“Paint a picture” of your project for the evaluators - the what, where, and why. This is the “heart” of your presentation and evaluators will draw conclusions based on the information presented about the *quality and function of the habitat* and the *demonstrated need to protect* it for fish and/or wildlife.

**THE BIGGER PICTURE.** How is this project supported by a current plan (i.e., local, watershed, statewide, agency, habitat conservation, open space, or species management plans), or a coordinated region-wide prioritization effort? What is the status of the plan? Does this project assist in implementation of a local shoreline master program, updated according to RCW 90.58.080 or local comprehensive plans updated according to RCW 36.70A.130? What process was used to identify this project as a priority? What specific role does this project play in a broader watershed or landscape picture? Is it part of a phased project? Is it a stand-alone site/habitat?

**UNIQUENESS/SIGNIFICANCE.** Explain how the site is unique or significant on a regional, ecosystem, watershed, and/or urban growth area level. How unique is the site in relation to habitat quality, connectivity, diversity, and rarity? How is the site important in providing critical habitat or biological function for wildlife species/communities? How does this site compare to others of the same type?

**FISH AND WILDLIFE SPECIES AND/OR COMMUNITIES.** What significant species/communities currently use the site? Which, if any, are the target species or communities<sup>1</sup>? (*“Target species” may or may not be special status species.*) Are the target species/communities geographically isolated to this particular site? Explain the condition of the population of target species. Which species have the potential and likelihood to use the site in the future and will reintroduction occur naturally or otherwise?

**QUALITY OF HABITAT.** Describe the ecological and biological quality of the habitat. What specific role does the habitat play in supporting the species/communities using the site? How is this habitat important in providing food, water, cover, connectivity, and resting areas? Are the size, quality, and other characteristics of the habitat adequate to support the target species/communities within the context of the Project Area? Has the habitat or characteristics of the site been identified as limiting factors or critical pathways to the target species/communities?

Revised April 18, 2006

---

<sup>1</sup> A *target species or community* is your project’s primary objective for protection and stands to gain the greatest benefit from the acquisition. For example, a project’s primary objective may be to acquire and protect high quality shrub-steppe. This is the “target community,” but that community also provides important habitat for shrub-steppe-dependent species.

**2. Species and/or Communities with Special Status. What is the significance of each species or community listed on your species and communities status matrix?**

RCW 79A.15.060 (6)(a) (iv, ix, xiii)

*In the interest of time, you may want to address only the species or communities that benefit the most from this project.* This question's intent is to determine the significance of the species or communities with special status and how they may benefit from your project. Some special status species or communities may benefit on a more passive basis, while others may benefit directly.

**IMMEDIACY OF THREAT TO THE SPECIES AND COMMUNITIES.** Describe the immediacy of threat to the species/community (e.g., imminent danger of extinction (range-wide); in imminent danger of extirpation (population); threatened within the foreseeable future, or concern because of current trends; population stable, but catastrophic event could threaten; no foreseeable threat).

**IMPORTANCE OF ACQUISITION TO SPECIES/COMMUNITY PROTECTION OR RECOVERY.** Describe the relative importance of this acquisition when compared to other protection /recovery tasks such as habitat restoration, captive breeding, translocation, regulatory protection, etc. Describe the distribution or range and, if known, the abundance of the species or community. Identify any recovery plans, conservation strategies or similar plans that include reference to this site. How does this project assist with recovery efforts for endangered, threatened, or sensitive species?

**ECOLOGICAL ROLES.** Does the species play an especially important role in the ecosystem in which it lives? Do other species depend on it for their survival? Will its loss substantially alter the functioning of the ecosystem?

**TAXONOMIC DISTINCTNESS.** How evolutionarily distinct is the species or community in question? That is, is it recognized as the only species in its genus or is it one of ten species in the genus? Is it only recognized as a subspecies? Some scientists think that more evolutionarily distinct organisms should have a higher priority for protection. Based on this assumption, if all else is equal, saving the sole surviving member of a genus may have a higher priority than saving an imperiled species within a large genus that contains many other species. Similarly, protecting a full species would normally be given a higher priority than protecting a subspecies and population. Example: The Olympic mudminnow (*Novumbra hubbsi*) is the sole surviving member of its genus *Novumbra*, whereas, the peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*) is a member of a large genus containing 37 species.

**RARITY.** Describe the distribution or range and, if known, the abundance of the species or community. Examples: The Olympic mudminnow occurs in western Washington and nowhere else in the world. The number of populations are fewer than in the past, but 14 of 16 populations monitored from 1993-1998 appear stable and in no immediate danger of extinction. The peregrine falcon is cosmopolitan, occurring on every continent. The two Washington subspecies were endangered; they increased from a low of 1 known breeding pair in 1978 to 56 breeding pair in 1999. The federal government considers this species recovered in the United States; it was removed from the federal endangered species list in 1999, but will be monitored for another decade.

Revised April 18, 2006

**3. Manageability and Viability. What is the likelihood of the site remaining viable over the long term and why is it important to secure it now?**

RCW 79A.15.060 (6)(a)(ii, iv, viii, x)

This question's intent is to determine whether the site can be managed, and how it will be managed, to protect the target species or communities.

**IMMEDIACY OF THREAT TO THE HABITAT.** What, and how imminent, are the threats to the habitat at the site (i.e., inherent, ecological, human, conversion, abatable and/or non-abatable threats)? Are these new threats or ongoing threats? How do or will these threats affect the function of the habitat? How will protection of the site affect these threats? What steps have already been taken to secure the land or reduce the threats?

**LONG-TERM VIABILITY.** What regulatory protections are currently afforded to the site (i.e., County Comprehensive Plan, Critical Areas Ordinances, zoning, development regulation, Shoreline Management rules, Forest Practice rules, etc.)? Demonstrate how the site will be managed over time to maintain the desired characteristics. Who will maintain it and what human and financial resources are available to do it? What management needs are there? Is the habitat recoverable? What restorative efforts, if any, are needed/planned? What is happening across the landscape or watershed that may affect the viability of the site? Describe any long-term site monitoring plans and identify who will implement monitoring?

**ENHANCEMENT OF EXISTING PROTECTED LAND.** Are there other protected lands (public and private) near or adjoining this site that have complementary or compatible land uses for the target species (consider wide-ranging or migratory species)? Are they managed in a manner consistent with the needs of the target species/communities? Is this site part of a larger ownership? If so, describe the connectivity and management of the other land.

**ON-GOING STEWARDSHIP.** Describe the on-going stewardship program for the site that includes control of noxious weeds and detrimental invasive species, and that identifies the source of funds from which the program will be funded.

Revised April 18, 2006

**4. Public Benefit. To what degree do communities, governments, landowners, constituent groups, or academia benefit from or support the project?**

RCW 79A.15.060 (6)(a)(i, xii)

This question's intent is to find out what *unique* benefits or support your project provides to organizations or communities. This question should not be equated with "public access" and is not meant to discount projects for *not* having overwhelming support or educational opportunities. It may be that your project has one or the other qualities and not both. Your answer will be scored on those unique qualities and how they are appropriate for, or of benefit to, your project.

**PROJECT SUPPORT.**

- a. Describe the support/partnerships you have from the community, interest groups, volunteers, public agencies, etc. How have you involved these groups in project development? Explain any known opposition to the project.
- b. Describe and document other monetary means that have been secured to help cover the costs for the project, i.e., grants, donations, in-kind contributions, etc.

**EDUCATIONAL AND/OR SCIENTIFIC VALUE.** Describe the scientific and educational values of the site. Is there an identified research or educational need documented in a management plan, thesis, or scientific journal related to the habitat, species, or communities at the site? How likely is it that these opportunities will come to fruition? How accessible is the site for these activities?

Revised May 7, 2003

**5. Public Use. Does this project provide potential opportunities for public access, education, and/or enjoyment?**

*Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State –2002-2007, Chapters 1 and 5.*

*Public use/access is only encouraged when and where it is appropriate. The intent of the question is to determine what level of public access is provided that will ensure resource values are sustained. Your answer will be scored on how the opportunities provided are appropriate for, or of benefit to, your project.*

**DESCRIBE PUBLIC USE THAT IS OR WILL BE PROVIDED AND WHY IT IS APPROPRIATE.** How will public use be managed to sustain resource values? Include important or unique details about construction techniques, placement of structures, timing of activities and access, on-site stewards, guided tours, etc. How likely is it that the public will use the site? How accessible is the site (in terms of remoteness, driving directions, distance from populated areas). Does the site provide opportunity for one or more special needs group? Will the site provide barrier-free access to persons challenged by sensory, mobility and or mental abilities? If so, briefly describe the facilities and how they meet ADA requirements/guidelines.

**DESCRIBE WHY PUBLIC USE IS NOT APPROPRIATE FOR THIS SITE.** How will the site be managed to limit or restrict public use. Describe what it is about the site, habitat, or the species using the site, that makes it sensitive to public use. What other opportunities exist nearby for recreational or educational experiences by the public?

<b>Appropriate level of public use when:</b>	<b>Possible points</b>
Access is provided	0-5 pts.
Access is <b>not</b> provided	0-3 pts.

**6. GMA Preference. Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA)?**

RCW 43.17.250 (GMA-preference required.)

**State law requires that:**

- (1) Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the applicant<sup>†</sup> has adopted a comprehensive plan and development regulations as required by RCW 36.70A.040 (“state law”).
- (2) When reviewing such requests, the state agency shall accord additional preference to applicants that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant is deemed to have satisfied the requirements for adopting a comprehensive plan and development regulations if it:
  - Adopts or has adopted within the time periods specified in state law;
  - Adopts or has adopted by the time it requests a grant or loan; or
  - Demonstrates substantial progress toward adopting within the time periods specified in state law. An agency that is more than six months out of compliance with the time periods has not demonstrated substantial progress.
- (3) A request from an applicant planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (2) over a request from an applicant-not planning under this state law.

This question is pre-scored by IAC staff based on information obtained from the state Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, GMA Division. To qualify for the current grant cycle, the GMA comprehensive plan and development regulations must be completed by IAC’s Technical Completion Deadline.

- a. The applicant does *not* meet the requirements of RCW 43.17.250 ..... (minus 1 point)
- b. The applicant *meets* the requirements of RCW 43.17.250 .....(0 points)
- c. The applicant is a nonprofit organization, state or federal agency .....(0 points)

IAC staff subtracts a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

---

<sup>†</sup> County, city, town, and special district applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to nonprofit organizations or state and federal agency applicants.

**7. Proximity to Urban Areas. Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities/towns, and county density?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.25.250 (IAC urban area parks);  
RCW 79A.15.060 (6)(b)(i)(WWRP);

This question is scored by IAC staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive credit, the map must describe the project area and contain a circle with a five-mile radius. As its hub, the circle must use the point on the project's boundary closest to a city or town. The single city or town (if any, including urban growth area boundary) with the highest population touched by the circles is counted in part "a," below. The result from "a" (cities) is added to the result from "b" (counties). This takes into account that counties with high *average* densities are made up of both high and low density areas.

Projects located near cities over 5000 population *and* within high density counties receive points from both "a" and "b".

A. Within 5 miles of a GMA urban growth area boundary or the boundary of an incorporated city/town. In either case, the score is based on the city/town population (OFM):

- 0 -4,999 (0 points)
- 5,000 -9,999 (1 point)
- 10,000 -29,999 (2 points)
- 30,000 -149,999 (3 points)
- 150,000 -299,999 (4 points)
- 300,000 -and above (5 points)

B. In a county with a population density (OFM) of:

- 0 -249 (0 points)
- 250 -324 (1 point)
- 325 -399 (2 points)
- 400 -474 (3 points)
- 475 -549 (4 points)
- 550 -and above (5 points)

IAC staff awards a maximum of 10 points that are later multiplied by 0.5.

Revised March 1997



**Attachment D  
Urban Wildlife Habitat Category  
Project Timeline  
January 26, 2007**

<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Action</b>
February 8-9, 2007	IAC Board Meeting – Provide direction on alternatives. Receive public comment.
End of February 2007	Subcommittee Meeting – discuss direction from IAC Board and next steps
March 14-15, 2007	IAC Grant Application Workshops – IAC staff publicizes proposed changes for 2008 grants.
April 2007	Formal public review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email to interested parties</li> <li>• Announcement on IAC website</li> <li>• Meetings with stakeholders</li> </ul>
May 2007	Subcommittee Meeting – discuss public comments and identify preferred alternative(s) for presentation to the IAC Board
June 7-8, 2007	IAC Board Meeting – Provide direction on recommendations from subcommittee. Receive public comment.
July-August 2007	IAC staff modify the manual and application materials as necessary.
September 13-14, 2007	First presentation of draft manual revisions. Receive public comment.
November 1-2, 2007	Final adoption of manual revisions. Receive public comment.
May 2008	Grant applications due – using the adopted revisions.