

December 19, 2007

## **Topic #12: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program State Lands Categories Policy Changes**

**Prepared & Presented By:** Myra Barker

**Approved by the Director:**

---

**Proposed Action:** Adopt Resolution 2008-09

### **Summary**

After the initial grant cycle of the State Lands categories, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) will consider an increase in the maximum grant award in the State Lands Development category and also revisions to the evaluation instruments to incorporate elements of the project narrative eliminating it as a separate application submittal. This memorandum summarizes proposed modifications and outlines staff's recommendations.

### **Staff Recommendation**

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.

### **Background**

The Washington State Legislature established the Washington Wildlife and Recreation program (WWRP) in 1991<sup>1</sup>. The State Lands categories were added in 2005 and are available only to the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources. The RCFB establishes program policies, including adoption of evaluation criteria<sup>2</sup> for these WWRP categories.

---

<sup>1</sup> WWRP is codified in RCW 79A.15 and WAC 286-27.

<sup>2</sup> Please refer to the separate attachments for the current evaluation criteria for both categories.

The State Lands Development (SLD) category provides grants for development and renovation and the State Lands Restoration (SLR) category provides grants for restoration and enhancement. All projects must be located on state owned lands.

The proposed changes were suggested by applicants, evaluators, and staff based on the 2006 application and evaluation process. Two major changes are proposed. One, to increase the maximum grant limits for State Lands Development projects. The second proposal is to modify the evaluation criteria in both categories to incorporate elements of the application "project narrative", which was required of applicants.

If changes are approved, the revised policies will be incorporated into Manuals #10a, *WWRP: Outdoor Recreation Account Policies and Project Selection*, and #10b *WWRP: Habitat Conservation Account: Policies and Project Selection*.

### **Proposed Change to Grant Limits**

The proposed change would increase the maximum limit for multi-site<sup>3</sup> and single site projects in the State Lands Development category.<sup>4</sup> Applicants requested an increase to the maximum limit to allow for those projects where complete development or renovation is more cost effective than partial improvements.

The table below illustrates the current limits and proposed changes.

	<i>Current</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
<b>State Lands Development</b>		
Minimum	\$25,000	No Change
Maximum multi-site	\$50,000 per site	\$100,000 per site
Maximum single site	\$250,000	\$325,000
	<i>Current</i>	<i>Proposed</i>
<b>State Lands Restoration</b>		
Minimum	\$25,000	No Change
Maximum multi-site	\$500,000 per site	No Change

---

<sup>3</sup> A multi-site project is one that covers more than one location. These projects are limited to no more than five sites in adjacent counties or within the same recreation area, natural area, or wildlife area. All elements included in a multi-site project must be of the same type. For example, a project may replace parking at three sites; the proposed increase is \$100,000 per site, with a total grant limit proposed at \$325,000.

<sup>4</sup> During the first cycle, 18 applications were submitted for the State Lands Development subcategory requesting \$3,937,403. Grant requests ranged from \$71,560 to \$250,000. With the appropriation of \$100 million for WWRP, the SLD subcategory received \$1,746,000. Seven projects received full funding and one project was partially funded. There were 13 applications submitted to the State Lands Restoration requesting \$2,398,007. The SLR subcategory received \$3,492,000 with the \$100 million appropriation. All projects were funded.

Maximum single site	\$1,000,000	No Change
---------------------	-------------	-----------

**Proposed Modification to Evaluation Criteria**

The proposed change incorporates elements from the application project narrative<sup>5</sup>, eliminating the narrative as a separate submittal, and to clarify existing evaluation questions in the State Lands criteria. No change is proposed to the evaluation criteria scoring.

Applicants struggled in preparing the project narrative so as not to provide duplicative information that had been included in the visuals, maps, and responses to the evaluation criteria. Evaluators also found redundancy between the project narrative, application materials, and the evaluation criteria.

The following tables outline the proposed modification to the evaluation criteria (attached).

**State Lands Development**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Proposed Change</i>	<i>Rationale for Change</i>
Public Need	Add “Consider whether or not the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan”.	Adds the project narrative element “Plan Priority” and is consistent with other WWRP evaluation criteria.
Site Suitability & Project Design	Add “How well does the project satisfy the identified need(s)?”	Adds the information provided from the project narrative element “Objective”. Helps to clarify how the proposed project is compatible with the site and described need.
Diversity & Compatibility of Recreational Uses	No change	
Plan Priority	Delete this as a stand-alone question; incorporate into “Public Need” as outlined above.	See above.
Performance Measures	Add “Outline the proposed project schedule, timelines, and who will perform the work”; add “How will the project impact the habitat, fish and wildlife resources, and provide public	Adds the project narrative element “Approach” and “Expected Results and Benefits”. Helps to clarify outcomes and to document

<sup>5</sup> A project narrative was required as part of the application materials and included the following elements: Need, Objective, Expected results and benefits, Approach to obtaining the objective, and Location.

	benefits?"	how the project will be managed and completed.
Public Benefit & Project Support	No change	

**State Lands Restoration**

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	<i>Proposed Change</i>	<i>Rationale for Change</i>
Ecological & Biological Characteristics	No change	
Need for Restoration or Enhancement	Add "How well does the project satisfy the identified need(s)?"	Adds the project narrative element "Objective". Helps to clarify how the project satisfies the described need.
Long-term Manageability & Viability	Add "Outline the proposed project schedule, timelines, and who will perform the work."	Adds the project narrative element "Approach". Helps to clarify how the proposed project will be managed and completed.
Species & Communities with Special Status	No change	
Plan Priority	No change	
Public Benefit	No change	

**Next Steps**

Currently staff is soliciting public comments on the proposed recommendations. Comments received will be distributed to the Board prior to its decision at the January meeting.

Any changes adopted by the Board will be incorporated into Manuals #10a, WWRP Outdoor Recreation Account: *Policies and Project Selection*, and #10b, WWRP Habitat Conservation Account: *Policies and Project Selection*, and will affect grant requests beginning with the 2008 grant cycle.

**Attachments**

- Resolution 2008-09
- Attachment A, State Lands Development Category Evaluation Criteria
- Attachment B, State Lands Restoration Category Evaluation Criteria

**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:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Resolution seconded by:* \_\_\_\_\_

*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.

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

**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).

## WWRP Scoring Criteria

### State Lands Development and Renovation

1. **PUBLIC NEED. Considering the availability and use of existing facilities within the service area, what is the need for new or improved facilities?**

*Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007, Chapter 5.*

Establish the recreation need by describing all available outdoor recreation opportunities (quality/quantity) within the service area. In general, areas with fewer outdoor recreation sites will score higher than those with more.

Other considerations:

- ▷ Existing capacity: Are nearby sites used to capacity?
- ▷ Are there unserved or under served user groups?
- ▷ Is there a threat to the public availability of the resources the site possesses?
- ▷ What are the demonstrated needs for development/renovation?
- ▷ Long-term manageability: How does the improvement or renovation contribute to ongoing management and maintenance of the facilities?
- ▷ How well will this project satisfy the needs identified?
- ▷ What is the expected or potential use upon completion of this project?
- ▷ Describe existing conditions and explain how this project will improve the visitor experience.
- ▷ Describe the project's statewide/regional significance.
- ▷ Consider whether or not the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan.

Point Range: 0 - 5

0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 4.

2. **SITE SUITABILITY AND PROJECT DESIGN. Does the project demonstrate good design criteria; does it make the best use of the site?**

Measure the quality of the functional and aesthetic aspects of the site design as related to the site and the proposed uses.

- ▷ Will site resources be made available appropriately for public use or recreation?
- ▷ Will natural, environmental, or other important values be protected by the proposed development?
- ▷ How well does the project satisfy the identified need(s)?

Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses.

Some design elements that may be considered include:

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| ▷ Accuracy of Cost Estimates      | ▷ Phasing                                  |
| ▷ Aesthetics                      | ▷ Recreation Experiences                   |
| ▷ Complexity of Permitting        | ▷ Readiness to proceed                     |
| ▷ Environmentally Friendly Design | ▷ Risk Management                          |
| ▷ Innovation and Sustainability   | ▷ Site suitability                         |
| ▷ Maintenance                     | ▷ Space Relationships                      |
| ▷ Materials                       | ▷ Suitability of the Proposed Improvements |
| ▷ Phasing                         | ▷ User Friendly/Barrier Free               |

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

3. **DIVERSITY OF AND COMPATIBILITY OF RECREATIONAL USES. To what extent does this project provide diversity of possible recreational uses?**

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

Sites can provide the opportunity for a variety of recreational uses. In general, projects providing more *compatible* recreation uses will score better than projects providing just one type of opportunity.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

~~4. **PLAN PRIORITY. How is this project supported by a current plan (i.e. local, state/regional resource, shoreline, open space, land use, outdoor recreation, agency) or a coordinated prioritization effort?**~~

- ~~▷ Describe the plan or prioritization efforts.~~
- ~~▷ What is the status of the plan(s)?~~
- ~~▷ How does this proposal help meet the goals and/or strategy of the plan?~~
- ~~▷ How important is this project in comparison to other potential projects?~~
- ~~▷ What process was used to identify this project as a priority?~~

Point Range: 0-5

~~Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.~~

**4. OUTCOME-FOCUSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES. To what extent does the project result in measurable progress toward goals and objectives for the recreation or access area?**

A grant award should be considered an investment with a measurable, positive return to the public in the long run. This question's intent is to find out what unique benefits your project provides and how those benefits are measured so you know you have been successful. In general, applicants who provide evidence or documentation of the goals and objectives associated with the project site and describe how the project results in measurable progress toward those goals should score higher.

Outline the proposed project schedule, timelines, and who will perform the work. Describe how the project will impact the habitat, fish and wildlife resources, and provide public benefits.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

5. **PUBLIC BENEFIT AND PROJECT SUPPORT. To what extent does this project result in measurable benefits for the community impacted as a result of this development or renovation?**

Benefit is the gain realized with the requested level of public investment. It can be a gain for the environment, gain for the general public or other gain. Proposals demonstrating greater net benefits should score higher than proposals with limited value, or with value at too great a cost. Cost can be unacceptable harm to the environment or something that causes unnecessary ill will.

Broadly interpret the term *project support* to include, but not be limited to:

- ▷ Explain the extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
- ▷ To what degree do communities, governments, landowners, constituent groups, or academia benefit from, or support, the project?
- ▷ How have you involved these groups in project development?
- ▷ Is there known opposition? Explain.
- ▷ Describe and document any monetary means that have been secured to help with implementation of the project (i.e., endowments, grants, donations, public/private management agreements, etc.)
- ▷ Identify endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user/"friends" groups.
- ▷ Describe the support or partnerships you have from the community, interest groups, volunteers, public agencies, etc.

Point Range: 0-5

RCO staff awards a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

6. **PROXIMITY TO HUMAN POPULATIONS. Is the project located in a populated area?**

RCW 79A.25.250 (IAC urban area parks)

IAC policy is to give funding preference to projects located in populated areas. Populated areas are defined (RCW 43.52.380) as a town or city with a population of 5,000 or more, or a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Is the project in an area meeting this definition?

Point Range: 0-1

RCO staff awards a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

**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.”*

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

## WWRP Scoring Criteria

### State Lands Restoration and Enhancement Category

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

**The Bigger Picture.** “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, restore, or enhance it*.

- What specific role does this project play in a broader watershed or landscape picture?
- Is this site part of a larger ownership? If so, describe the connectivity and management of the larger habitat area.
- What are the primary habitat functions?
- Does the project have functional connectivity with existing habitats?

**Uniqueness/Significance.** Explain how the site is unique or significant on a regional, ecosystem, watershed, and/or urban growth area level.

- What habitat types exist on site?
- 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?

**Quality Of Habitat.** Describe the ecological and biological quality or potential 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 for wildlife?
- What natural features make this site a priority for restoration/enhancement efforts?
- How well does the restoration or enhancement project contribute to supporting the target species or communities?
- Has the habitat or characteristics of the site been identified as limiting factors or critical pathways to the target species/communities?

Point Range: 0-5  
Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3

**Need for Restoration/Enhancement. What is the need for stewardship activities, whether restoration or enhancement?** Establish need by identifying comparable opportunities (quality and quantity). Describe the quality and function of the habitat and the demonstrated need and plans to restore or enhance it.

- Is the site located in an ecologically critical area?
- Is the habitat recoverable?
- What is the restoration plan?
- Does this project enhance other restoration efforts with the same/similar goals?
- How well does the project satisfy the identified need(s)?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3

2. **Long-Term Manageability and Viability. Will the project result in restoring or enhancing land that function in a manner that is sustainable and integrates appropriately with bordering communities or habitats? What is the likelihood of the site remaining viable over the long term and why is it important to restore or enhance it now?** .

**Threats to the Habitat.** What, and how imminent, are the threats (i.e., inherent, ecological, human, abatable and/or non-abatable threats) to the habitat at this site?

- Are these new threats or ongoing threats?
- How do or will these threats affect the function of the habitat?
- How will restoration/enhancement of the site affect these threats?
- What steps are you taking to reduce the threats?
- Outline the proposed project schedule, timelines, and who will perform the work.

**Long-Term Viability.** Describe how the site will be managed over time to maintain the desired characteristics.

- What is happening across the landscape or watershed that may affect the viability of the site?
- What are the long-term stewardship plans and the anticipated outcome? Describe any long-term site monitoring plans and identify who will implement monitoring?
- What human and financial resources are available to maintain the site? How will noxious weeds and invasive species be controlled?
- What regulatory protections are currently afforded to the site (i.e., Critical Areas Ordinances, zoning, development regulation, Shoreline Management rules, Forest Practice rules, etc.)?

**Enhancement of Existing Protected Land.** Described the other protected lands (public and private) near or adjoining this site that have complimentary or compatible land uses or habitats.

- Are they managed and monitored in a manner that is consistent with the stewardship plans for the project area?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2

**3. Species and/or Communities with Special Status. What are the habitat communities or species of wildlife that will benefit most from the improvements proposed for this site?**

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.

**Threat to the Species or Communities.** Describe the 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 Restoration/Enhancement for the Species/Community Protection or Recovery.** Describe the relative importance of this habitat restoration or enhancement effort when compared to other protection /recovery tasks. 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.

**Ecological Roles.** What role does the target species play 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? What role does the restoration or enhancement play in the viability of the larger ecosystem?

**Rarity.** Describe the distribution or range and, if known, the abundance of the species or community

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1

**4. Plan Priority. How is this project supported by a current plan (i.e. watershed, stewardship, state/regional resource, species management, shoreline, salmon recovery, open space, land use, habitat conservation, agency) or a coordinated prioritization effort? Describe the plan or prioritization efforts.**

- What is the status of the plan(s)?
- How does this proposal help meet the goals and/or strategy of the plan?
- How important is this project in comparison to other potential projects?

- What process was used to identify this project as a priority?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1

**5. Public Benefit. To what extent does this project result in measurable benefits for the species or community impacted as a result of this restoration or enhancement?**

This question's intent is to find out what *unique* benefits your project provides to maintaining an ecologically diverse ecosystem and how are those benefits measured so you know you have been successful. This question is not meant to discount projects for *not* having overwhelming community support or educational opportunities. It may be that your project has qualities that provide a unique opportunity for the community to benefit from its implementation. Your answer will be scored on those unique qualities and how they are appropriate for, or are of benefit to, your project.

**Measurable Benefits.** The response should describe what ecosystem functions will be restored and how well will the proposed habitat actions address the restoration or enhancement needs identified.

**Educational and 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?

**Community Support.** Describe the support or partnerships you have from the community, interest groups, volunteers, public agencies, etc.

- To what degree do communities, governments, landowners, constituent groups, or academia benefit from or support the project?
- How have you involved these groups in project development? Explain any known opposition to the project.
- Describe and document any monetary means that have been secured to help continue stewardship of the habitat area (i.e., endowments, grants, donations, public/private management agreements, etc.)

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1

### Instructions: Species and Communities with Special Status Table

**Species and Communities With Special Status Table.** Complete and submit the table on page 12. This is a required part of the application. Staff will verify the information and evaluators will be given a copy of the table along with the other project materials. This table relates directly to Evaluation Question #4, Species and Communities with Special Status, with emphasis on the significance of the species. As part of the evaluation question responses, applicants must describe the significance information to evaluators for scoring.

**Species, Community or Habitat Type.** List each species, community, or habitat type with special status present in your project area or work site.

**Occurrence.** For special status animal species, indicate whether the occurrence of the species at the site is *breeding, feeding, migration, resting, perching, roosting, wintering, rearing, spawning, year-round resident, individual occurrence, or unknown*. For special status plant species, communities or habitat types, enter "N/A" in the occurrence column.

**Status and Source.** Indicate the status of the species and the source from which you obtained the information. Federal and state status and source information follows:

**Federally Listed Species:**

- Resident fish and wildlife–Endangered Species Office, Lacey (360) 753-9440
- Pacific salmon species–National Marine Fisheries Service; [www.noaa.gov/](http://www.noaa.gov/)

**State Listed Species and Candidate Species:**

- Endangered Species Section, WDFW, (360) 902-2515; [www.wa.gov/wdfw/wildlife.htm](http://www.wa.gov/wdfw/wildlife.htm)

**Priority Habitats and Species:**

- Priority Habitat and Species Program, WDFW, (360) 902-2543; [www.wa.gov/wdfw/habitat.htm](http://www.wa.gov/wdfw/habitat.htm)

**State Listed Plant Species and Communities:**

- Natural Heritage Program, DNR (360) 902-1667; [www.wa.gov/dnr/](http://www.wa.gov/dnr/)

RCO will provide data request forms for both state databases. If your information came from a source other than these (such as a consultant or local biologist), please indicate on your form.

Federal Status		State Status	
FE	Endangered	SE	State endangered
FT	Threatened	ST	State threatened
FP	Proposed for threatened or endangered	SS	State sensitive
FC	Candidate for listing status review	SC	Candidate for listing status review
FSC	Species of concern	PS	Priority Species, non-listed but vulnerable
		PH	Priority Habitat
		P1, P2, P3	Priority 1, Priority 2, and Priority 3 (plants)

**Example Matrix:**

Species, Community or Habitat Type	Occurrence	Status	Source
Douglas Fir/ Western Hemlock/ Swordfern Community	N/A	P 2	DNR – WNHP
Brown Pelican	foraging, resting	FE, SE	WDFW – PHS
Thompson's Clover	N/A	P 2	DNR – WNHP
Chinook Salmon	rearing	FE	NMFS; SSHIAP *
Western Pond Turtle	year-round resid't	FSC, SE	USFWS; Consultant
Riparian Area	N/A	PH	WDFW – PHS

\* SSHIAP Salmon & Steelhead Habitat Inventory & Assessment Program (NW Indian Fisheries Commission /WDFW)

