

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board

Summary Minutes

Day 1

Date: March 27, 2008

Place: Natural Resources Bldg. #172
Olympia, Washington

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Steven Drew	Olympia
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Dave Brittell	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Rex Derr	Director, 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 9:10 a.m. Introductions were made and a quorum was determined.

MEETING CONSENT CALENDAR

(See notebook item #2)

Reviewed Resolution #2008-010 Consent Calendar approving:

- a) Approval of RCFB Minutes – January 15, 2008
- b) Time Extensions
- c) Project Type Change
- d) Scope Changes
- e) Cost Increases
- f) Conversions

Rex Derr **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-010 approving the items on the Consent Calendar. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-010 **APPROVED** as presented.

MANAGEMENT REPORTS

Director Kaleen Cottingham presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #3 for detailed report.)

- Staffing Update

- Kaleen introduced Rebecca Connolly, Board Liaison, whose role includes coordinating the Board agenda and helping with strategic planning. She also is the accountability/performance manager, public disclosure officer, and contracts manager.
- Berk Report
 - Staff is evaluating and implementing the recommendations that have come out of the Berk Report. Kaleen noted that, in an effort to make grant recipients more accountable for finishing their projects on time, all grant recipients were notified this week that they must give at least 60 days notice before the project end date of the need for a time extension.
- 2008 Preliminary Grant Requests
 - Kaleen talked about the marketing efforts that have been underway to get information out to the public regarding our grant programs. She reported record attendance at the application workshops that were held in February and nearly 500 proposed applications that have been received as of March 19. Deadline for applications is May 1.
 - Kaleen reported that there is some concern that the State Lands Restoration Category is currently undersubscribed.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

A number of bills were introduced during the 2008 legislative session that had the potential to affect the RCO, but few of the bills had significant impact. Jim highlighted a few of the bills.

- SB6638 – Loss of potential future revenue for the Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) grant program
- SB6532 – Loss of revenue for the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) program
- SSB6761 – Wetland mitigation banking
- SSB6805 – Study on farm-based conservation markets
- E2HB2488 – Creating an Evergreen Communities Partnership Taskforce
- SHB2472 – Recreation on DNR-managed lands

The capital budget includes language that:

- Allows \$450,000 of off-road vehicle (ORV) noise enforcement funds to be allocated from the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) account before funds are divided among the four funding categories. This change will result in additional funds being available for alternate education and enforcement (E&E) projects and slightly less money available for the 2008 NOVA facilities grant cycle.
- Authorizes the RCFB to move excess dollars in a YAF grant category to one of the other categories
- Requires the RCFB to conduct a study on hazards to the public from personal high-speed watercraft.

PRESENTATION OF STATE PARKS PROJECTS

Larry Fairleigh, State Parks Assistant Director, gave a PowerPoint presentation of development and acquisition projects they have completed with RCO assistance. Larry thanked the Board and staff for their part in making the parks a reality for a significant public good.

STATE PARKS RANKING PROCESS AND CRITERIA

Marguerite Austin presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #6 for details.)

In January, the Board reviewed changes proposed for the State Parks category of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP). The revisions were proposed in response to a request from the State Parks Commission to modify the evaluation process and criteria to better meet their needs and priorities. Staff recommended adoption of the State Parks category evaluation process and criteria.

Marguerite explained the proposed evaluation process.

Bill Chapman commented that he is fine with the concept of State Parks ranking their own projects, especially since it appears that the public element will still be included in the process. He is concerned, however, because the project design and immediacy of threat point values each were reduced from 10 to five.

Marguerite explained that State Parks requested that staff change the point values because leaving the current values would give those criteria a greater percentage of total points than they currently have and skew the project ranking. State Parks wanted to be sure that the project significance criterion stands out.

Bill strongly urged that the point values not be reduced. He pointed out the importance of immediacy of threat to the fundamental elements of the ranking process.

Rex discussed the state's role in the big picture of recreation versus the local government's role. He posed the question of whether the state should buy more property when it cannot take care of what it has.

Marguerite noted that statute requires that this category allocate at least 75 percent of the monies to the acquisition of property.

Steven Drew **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-011 approving the proposed State Parks ranking process and criteria. Bill Chapman **SECONDED**.

Bill Chapman **MOVED TO AMEND** the resolution by increasing immediacy of threat and project design evaluation criteria to 10 points each. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Rex noted that State Parks would be fine with the point change.

The motion to amend the resolution was **APPROVED**.

Resolution #2008-011 **APPROVED** as amended.

CONVERSION OF LYNNWOOD COMMUNITY ATHLETIC FIELD

Dan Haws presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #7 for details.)

The Edmonds School District requested Board approval for conversion of the Lynnwood Community Athletic Fields located on the campus of the existing Lynnwood High School. The school district plans to convert 12.4 acres, which is a Land and Water Conservation Fund

(LWCF) assisted site. It has identified replacement property to remedy the conversion. The proposed conversion and replacement sites each are valued at \$7.5 million.

The Edmonds School District has submitted all documents needed to satisfy the conversion. The City of Lynnwood, which is the project's co-sponsor, has asked the Board to delay consideration until its June 2008 Board meeting.

Staff was prepared to recommend approval of the conversion, but in consideration of the city's request, staff recommended delaying action until the June 2008 Board meeting.

Public testimony:

Mark Laurence, chair of the "Save our Fields" citizen's committee, expressed concerns related to the conversion process and was prepared to ask the Board to postpone their decision. He believes the recommendations of the RCO staff are biased toward the Edmonds School District and that the Board does not have the best advice to render a decision. He would appreciate the Board's close attention to this project.

Chair Ogden believes that RCO staff has taken extraordinary effort to be accurate with their information.

Steven Drew would like more information before making a decision. He would also like clarity on what is within the full scope of purview for the Board to make a decision regarding this conversion.

Chair Ogden concurred that more information is necessary, so action on this subject has been delayed until June.

CONVERSION REQUESTS: WDFW AND DNR RESOURCES LAND EXCHANGES

Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #8 for details.)

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) wants to convert approximately 26,185 acres of wildlife area lands acquired with grants awarded by the RCFB. They are planning a land exchange with the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR). The exchange involves converting these properties because they will no longer be used for habitat or recreation purposes.

WDFW has identified parcels for conversion and replacement, and is conducting appraisals of all properties. WDFW originally expected the land exchange to occur by June 30, 2008, but with the complexity of the transactions, the date of closing has been moved to November 15, 2008.

Staff has prepared four options for Board consideration on how to proceed with this conversion request:

1. Delegate approval authority to the RCO director;
2. Conduct a special Board meeting when the conversion package is complete;
3. Defer action to the June meeting; or
4. Take no action at this time.

Chair Ogden asked if there is still a need to take action in June since the timeline was moved back to November.

Dave Brittell pointed out that with each parcel of property having its own set of purchase and sale issues to be worked out, there are a lot of pieces to come together and some of the parcels don't involve this Board. The goal is to try to reduce the moving pieces by May 15 and bring before the Board in June.

Craig Partridge explained that the way it stands now, this is an undesirable ownership pattern and it is probably cleaner to view it as a conversion. A lot of recreational activity occurs on the land, however the primary purpose of biodiversity conservation and protection will continue.

Bill Chapman supports the recommendation to defer any action on this topic until the June meeting. He talked about some of the challenges that are sure to be addressed as DNR and WDFW sort out recreation and habitat values of the land in the context of a habitat conservation plan.

Public testimony:

Bill Robinson, representing The Nature Conservancy, encouraged the Board to approve the land exchange. He noted how habitat fragmentation is a big threat to biodiversity protection on a broad scale. In addition to benefitting WDFW and DNR, the exchange would also benefit biodiversity conservation by keeping the land in its original use format.

Steve Saunders, DNR's Division Manager for Asset Management, reported that the June date would work for DNR to have a decision on the conversion. He talked about the process of consolidating ownership and creating landscapes that can be better managed.

Rex asked about the level of public understanding and confidence in making the land exchange and whether they expect any controversy.

Steve Saunders reported that they have provided dozens of public meetings around the state to explain the land exchange process and have received a lot of community support. A few concerns were voiced regarding maintaining access and cattle grazing, but otherwise there seems to be widespread support.

Craig noted that the Legislature has been extremely supportive of the land exchange with their dollars.

Dave pointed out that the state agencies want to be respectful of the required process instead of just swapping land.

Chair Ogden noted that further discussion and action on this topic will be deferred to the June meeting.

WWRP FARMLAND PROGRAM GRANT AWARDS

Kammie Bunes presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #9 for details.)

As required by statute, the ranked list of projects was submitted to the Governor and included as part of the 2009 Supplemental Capital Budget request to the legislature. The legislature approved \$100 million for the program in the 2007-2009 budget. Most of the funds have been distributed, but \$4.7 million remains in the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account. Staff is requesting final funding approval for projects evaluated during the 2007 grants cycle.

Staff noted two changes to Resolution #2008-013 as follows:

1. The amount available for farmland preservation projects was changed from "\$4.3" to "\$4.7" million.
2. Added the wording "WHEREAS, providing funds to the projects would further the Board's strategic goal to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process".

Jeff commended staff for getting a full complement of projects to use up the funds.

Kaleen noted that many of the projects were relying on federal match money, which is not coming through. Staff has extended the timeline for applicants to find an alternate source of match.

Jeff Parsons **MOVED** to adopt Revised Resolution #2008-013 approving the Farmland Program Grant Awards. Bill Chapman **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-013 **APPROVED** as presented.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM – MODEL AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION EASEMENT

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

Staff is not recommending changes to the model agricultural conservation easement at this time. Following the Board's direction from June 2007, as long as grant recipients can demonstrate how their proposed agricultural conservation easement meets the intent of the RCFB model, staff will work with them toward a final document that meets their needs and protects the WWRP investment.

Kammie reported that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has reviewed our easement template and suggested minor changes to clarify federal rules.

In an effort for grant managers to be more involved on the front end of the easement process, staff will be working to set up a process with grant applicants to review their easement before the final language has been negotiated with the landowner.

Bill Chapman noted that it would be very reasonable to ask the applicant for a copy of their easement in red-line format. He commented that property rights can be difficult issues at times and will continue to be a challenge, but well worth the effort.

BIODIVERSITY COUNCIL STRATEGY UPDATE

Sarah Gage, senior project associate for the Biodiversity Council, presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #11 for details.)

Kaleen explained that this topic was selected for the agenda to allow the Board to consider how this biodiversity strategy might work into our grant programs.

Sarah talked about the Washington Biodiversity Conservation Strategy document, which was released by the council in December 2007. She highlighted the importance of two pilot projects that were funded by the council – the Pierce County Biodiversity Alliance and the Healthy Land Initiative in North Central Washington, both of which provided practical experience at the local level.

Chair Ogden asked if any of the current evaluation criteria give points for biodiversity conservation. Kaleen responded that at this time there are no extra points given for biodiversity, but that may change in the future.

The Chair asked if the council had considered doing something to increase visibility and involvement of more people. Sarah replied that they had sponsored two successful conferences and council members are interested in the outreach aspect.

Kaleen noted that the future governance structure is one of the efforts that the council has been specifically directed to bring back later this year.

Bill asked if there are areas that scientists agree rank low in terms of biodiversity and not worth the time to invest in conservation. Sarah responded that the council did not want to set aside areas as unworthy of conservation.

Jeff Parsons asked whether anyone on the council is involved in developing curriculum that could be used in various parts of the state.

Sarah noted that the council found that many educational programs on biodiversity conservation already exist. They decided to put their efforts into adding conservation values into existing curricula and have partnered with the E3 initiative led by the Environmental Education Association of Washington.

NOVA NOISE ENFORCEMENT GRANT AWARDS AND USE OF EXCESS FUNDING

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #13 for details.)

Staff recommended approval for funding 10 off-road vehicle noise enforcement projects requesting \$313,225 out of an available \$450,000 in NOVA program motor vehicle fuel tax funds. Each of the 10 projects has been reviewed by the evaluation team and is eligible for funding.

Because requests are less than the total available funds, staff will take the following steps to help ensure use of the excess dollars:

- Extend the current grant cycle for this program until April 1, 2008 with final funding consideration by the Board in June.
- Organize an instruction and certification class, using ORV noise enforcement funds, in accord with the capital budget directive.
- Review the 2007 NOVA Education and Enforcement (E&E) grants to determine if any of the proposals include noise enforcement. If so, it may be possible to coordinate with the grantee to exchange an appropriate amount of ORV noise enforcement funds for current E&E grant funds. This would have the effect of freeing up 2007 E&E dollars for use with other requests.

Craig commended staff for their creativity on option 3. He asked whether the new applications would be enough to use the excess funds.

Greg noted that after looking at the applications that have come in, it is highly likely that there still will be money left over.

Steven wondered whether grant recipients who provide noise enforcement classes could use excess funds to purchase equipment and develop a resource bank giving individuals the opportunity to borrow the equipment.

Dave Brittell **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-014. Craig Partridge **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-014 **APPROVED** as presented.

NOVA POLICY ON FUNDING ALLOCATION

Jim Fox presented this agenda item and provided background for this topic. (See notebook item #14 for details.)

A Board subcommittee consisting of Jeff Parsons and Steven Drew reviewed NOVA fund allocations and does not recommend any change to the policy regarding how gasoline tax and permit fees are allocated to the off-road vehicle (ORV) category. However, to award funds to projects in a timelier manner and reduce the amount of money carried forward to the next grant cycle, staff and the subcommittee propose the following process for allocating funds:

1. First, apply "returned" funds to the next ranked project; add any remaining funds to the competitive pool.
2. Expand the criteria for allocating competitive dollars, and award them after awarding ORV permit dollars.
3. Allocate any current year excess funds to other categories.
4. Front-load distribution of funds in a biennium's first year.

The proposed changes were sent out for public review. Most comments favored implementation of the proposal.

The NOVA advisory committee unanimously agreed to recommend that the Board accept the subcommittee's proposal with the following changes: 1) Do not add additional allocation criteria for distribution of competitive dollars; 2) Do not change the order in which ORV permit fees and competitive dollars are distributed. ORV permit fees should be distributed last so it would not penalize those who already pay this additional tax. Staff and the Board subcommittee did not change their proposed process based on the advisory committee recommendations.

Steven Drew **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-015. Jeff Chapman **SECONDED**. Steven Drew **MOVED TO AMEND** the resolution by removing the words “up to” in the last paragraph to read, “the RCFB will allocate up to 70% of the NOVA recreation category dollars in the first grant cycle of the biennium and the remaining funds in the second cycle.” Jeff Parsons **SECONDED** the motion to amend.

The motion to amend was **APPROVED**.

Resolution #2008-015 **APPROVED** as amended.

Jim thanked the subcommittee for their time commitment and excellent work.

NRTP POLICY ON USE OF EXCESS FUNDS

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #15 for detailed report.)

The Board directed staff to propose a process for moving qualified but unfunded NRTP projects to a category or categories with excess funds. Doing so would address the challenge the Board has had in meeting NRTP’s minimum fund allocation requirements in the program’s two motorized categories, and should help ensure the use of funds in a timely manner.

Jim pointed out that the Board does not have authority to move funds from one category to another, but does have authority to move projects from one category to another. He explained the following proposed process for moving qualified projects to categories with excess funding:

1. Staff will use the decision tree to determine which category is the best fit for the application and would give it the highest likelihood of success. At that time, staff also will determine if there are other categories in which the project would be eligible.
2. After projects are evaluated, but before the Board meeting when grants are awarded, staff will identify the highest scoring partly-funded or unfunded project and determine whether it could be funded by shifting it (or a funded project higher on the list) to a category with excess funds. Staff would recommend that the Board shift the project if:
 - The project to be shifted is eligible for placement in that category.
 - There are enough excess funds for the project in that category.
 - The category change does not affect an education project(s).
3. The process would be repeated, in order of project scores, until the excess funds are exhausted or there are no more projects eligible for a move.
4. If there are unobligated funds remaining, they will be carried forward to the same category in the next grant cycle.

The proposed changes were sent out for public review. Most comments favored implementation of the proposal.

Steven asked whether parts of a project can be moved from one category to another.

Jim explained that the proposal is for whole projects only. Prorating the projects across multiple categories would be problematic. Nonmotorized categories are typically shortest of funds. If projects have anything but an incidental motorized component, they can be moved into the compatible use category which always has excess funds.

Craig Partridge **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-016. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Public testimony:

John Keates, who has been an NRTP project evaluator for a number of years, commented that he has always been concerned about the motorized community not submitting enough applications. He asked if the Board would consider waiting one more round before changing the policy to give the motorized community enough time to be ready with good project proposals.

Chair Ogden appreciates his concern, but is worried the Legislature might pull the money if we don't use it as we have been working on this issue for a long time.

Craig pointed out that by taking this action the Board would actually be encouraging the motorized community to come forward.

Steven agrees that not to take action would be a disincentive for new projects. It is important to take action today.

Resolution #2008-016 **APPROVED** as presented.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLICY PROPOSAL FOR “DO NOT FUND” RECOMMENDATIONS

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #16 for detailed report.)

During grant evaluations, one or more evaluators occasionally suggest that a specific project does not merit funding. In response, staff solicited input on a process for evaluators to recommend that the Board not fund a specific project (a “do not fund” process). The decision about whether or not to fund a project would remain with the Board. Staff received favorable comments about the proposal.

Staff recommends that the Board initially adopt a “do not fund” process on a trial basis in the NOVA program. If the trial is successful, staff would recommend whether to make the process permanent in NOVA and whether to implement the process for other grant programs.

Greg explained that, at present, advisory committees rank the projects. If funds are available, projects usually are funded, regardless of score. Advisory committees are very reluctant to recommend against funding projects, even though some members may think it is the best course of action. Without a process in place, a “do not fund” recommendation is even more difficult.

Greg described the proposed process.

1. Technical reviews: Add a project of concern (POC) checkbox to review sheets.
2. Evaluations: Add the same POC checkbox to evaluation score sheets.
3. If five or more evaluators check the POC box, the related project(s) becomes a post evaluation meeting agenda item.
4. Applicant is invited to attend the post evaluation to respond to questions.
5. To validate the process, 60% of evaluators must participate.
6. For a “do not fund” recommendation to be sent to the Board, 60% of the evaluators must agree to present form.
7. Recommend that RCFB not fund the project(s).

Chair Ogden pointed out that it would be nice to have a “do not fund” policy in place that could be used if needed.

Steven expressed concern about logistics for the applicant. He would like assurance that there is opportunity for everyone to discuss a project of concern.

Chair Ogden pointed out that it is the Board’s responsibility to do the policy work and staff could work out the process.

Craig would rather have a less formal alternative that would focus more on using the Board’s discretion rather than the advisory committee. This should be a Board decision and not just a rubber stamp of the committee’s recommendation to not fund a project.

Bill Chapman **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-017. Rex Derr **SECONDED**.

Bill agrees with the premise of giving the Board a recommendation, and would like to encourage the advisory committee to identify projects of concern. The Board needs to know when projects should not be funded, even if they meet the eligibility requirements.

Craig would like to modify the process and provide a less formal mechanism for the evaluators to identify projects of concern.

Rex voiced concern that this process may be too subjective. If we have a “do not fund” process, we would need to relate it to our strategic objective to use public funds.

Jeff believes that if someone raises an issue about a project, the Board should be made aware of it.

Bill withdrew his original motion to approve Resolution #2008-017.

Chair Ogden asked staff to work on the “do not fund” resolution and bring it back to the Board in June.

STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

Kaleen Cottingham presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #17 for details.)

The first step in preparing the 2009-2011 biennial budget is to revisit and update strategic plans to set direction for the 2009-2013 timeframe. RCO’s strategic plan is due to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) on June 13, 2008 and the RCO’s next biennial budget is due on September 1, 2008. Staff has begun to change the strategic plan to better align core work, organization, and performance.

Kaleen discussed how the RCO supports five distinct boards, each with its own strategic plan. She is working with staff to reframe the existing plan with an overarching umbrella of strategic direction for the office and then silos for each of the boards. She would like to realign performance measures more carefully with the strategic elements and possibly reduce the objectives and measures in the plan to reflect the RCO’s core work and 2008 work plan.

Bill noted that he is a strong supporter of strategic plans and would like to see performance measures aligned with where the RCFB wants to go.

Chair Ogden is concerned to see references to helping “clients” in the strategic framework document but no mention of “partnership”.

Rex thanked staff for having the strategic plan reflected in every resolution, as Board decisions should support the strategic plan.

Jeff remarked that performance targets should be tangible and measurable, such as getting programs fully subscribed and getting monies fully spent.

Dave wants to make sure that when we talk about silos we should also highlight the partnership between them.

~~Kaleen would like to have one umbrella document so there's clarity for the office. An RCO operations and policy management retreat is planned for April 11 to take the next steps in updating the strategic plan. She asked how Board members would like to view a draft of the strategic plan when the due date is June 13, one week prior to the next meeting of this Board.~~

~~Chair Ogden suggested sending the document electronically to the Board members with any comments or changes sent back to Kaleen.~~

~~Kaleen would like to combine the previous planning documents into one overarching strategic plan to provide more clarity for the office. An RCO operations and policy management retreat is planned for April 11 to take the next steps in updating the plan. The final strategic plan is due June 13, one week prior to the next Board meeting.~~

~~Staff will provide copies of all the planning documents for the Board to review. Kaleen asked Board members to email comments or changes back to her by April 10.~~

BERK REPORT ON RCO'S GRANT PROCESSES – NEXT STEPS

Rachael Langen presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #18 for details.)

Rachael discussed how the RCO hired Berk and Associates (Berk) to examine the reasons for the occasional un-timeliness in completing grant projects as scheduled. When deadlines are missed, planned payouts do not occur and the agency must request that the Legislature re-appropriate the funds.

Kaleen has established four internal work teams to analyze the 36 recommendations provided by Berk. Rachael highlighted some of the findings from the report.

- RCO's rate of reappropriation is relatively high
- Project delay is systemic across programs, project, and sponsor type
- Project delay is caused by many internal and external factors
- Grant managers' workload influences project delivery and delay
- Lack of standardization in internal processes and policies also contribute to delays
- There are no formal reporting and information systems in place
- RCO response to project delay helps perpetuate the cycle
- Other grant agencies are experiencing similar project delay issues

~~Steven believes that lack of communication is a large part of the reappropriation problem and that it is crucial to keep in close contact with the Legislature, OFM, and project sponsors.~~

Steven believes that better communication about the nature of sensitive area projects and the reason for delays would help the agency weather harsh judgment where when reappropriations cannot be avoided.

Kaleen reported that since 47 percent of project delays are attributable to state agencies, she will be meeting with each one to discuss their project milestones and ways to improve grant management.

Bill didn't see anything in the report concerning a broader look at different kinds of problems that cause project delay, such as difficulty in obtaining permits and unwilling landowners. He believes OFM and the Legislature need to have realistic expectations based on external challenges that project sponsors face.

Kaleen noted that the Berk report mainly focuses on things that are within our control to improve.

Rex commended staff for having the report done. State Parks has also gone through an agency improvement process and Rex found it very beneficial. He encouraged the Board to provide support as the agency goes through this worthwhile process. He requested that the Board receive a regular status update.

STATE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN

Jim Eychaner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #19 for details.)

Jim explained that to be eligible to receive Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grants, the state must submit a State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Planning (SCORP) document to the National Park Service every five years. The current SCORP expires in June 2008. Staff has developed a new draft SCORP document that requires public review and RCFB approval before it is submitted to the Governor and the National Park Service (NPS).

Jim gave a brief outline of the draft SCORP document that emphasizes the roles and responsibilities of Washington State government in outdoor recreation.

Jim discussed the SCORP recommendation for a level of service (LOS) approach to measuring the state's investment in recreation, for both state and local agency sites and facilities. The measure is based on a grading system, with a lower score showing a need for more investment resources in order to achieve a target level of service. The proposed criteria are:

1. Baseline: Resource protection (state) or per capita participation (local)
2. Enhanced: Service area/population-based
3. In-Depth: Function-based

Jim reported that a year and a half ago, he received mostly negative feedback from local agencies concerning this experimental tool. Now he is getting reports that communities are beginning to adopt this approach.

Kaleen asked the Board if they felt this draft SCORP document is moving in the right direction. Board members concurred.

Rex Derr **MOVED** to authorize the director to finalize and submit the SCORP document after public review, as long as it clearly represents the strategic objectives. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Motion **APPROVED**.

ENHANCED STATEWIDE RECREATION AND CONSERVATION PLANNING

Jim Eychaner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #20 for details.)

The Board has expressed interest in participating in the development of a more strategic approach to recreation and conservation investments and a visionary look out into the future. This approach would build on the new SCORP document that is scheduled to be submitted to the Governor and the NPS in June.

Jim gave some examples of the kinds of strategic thinking that could go into a future vision for public investments in recreation and conservation. He noted that it doesn't need to be strategic planning but could be more agenda-setting for the Board.

Staff recommends appointing a Board subcommittee to work with RCO staff to develop a preferred direction.

Craig noted that he has been an advocate for this type of plan that would tee up key issues for discussion and big picture recommendations for the Legislature.

Jeff suggested staff approach the issue as a service provider, not a regulatory agency.

Jeff, Bill, and Rex volunteered to form a subcommittee to work with staff on this issue.

The meeting recessed for the evening at 4:15 p.m.

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Summary Minutes

Day 2

Date: March 28, 2008

Place: Natural Resources Bldg. #172
Olympia, Washington

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Steven Drew	Olympia
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Dave Brittell	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Rex Derr	Director, 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.

The meeting was reconvened at 8:40 a.m. by Chair Val Ogden. The Chair noted that Craig Partridge would be absent from the meeting today due to other obligations.

Rex Derr announced that he would need to leave before the end of the meeting today. The Chair reported that there would still be enough members to make a quorum.

INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL UPDATE

Bridget Moran, Invasive Species Council Chair, presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #21 for details.)

Bridget gave an update on the council's work since its inception in 2006. The council's role is to foster communication and coordination among the entities that are already doing the work to prevent and control invasive species. She noted preliminary data shows that about \$28.5 million per biennium is being spent by the various entities statewide on dealing with invasive species. The most serious economic threat at this time is the zebra mussel.

Bridget reported that one of the requirements of the council is to develop a statewide strategic plan to respond to and provide direction on how to address the threat of invasive species. A draft plan is out for public review on RCO's website.

Rex pointed out that State Parks was not represented on the council but would like to be added. Bridget responded that they would be a great asset to the team.

Jeff would like to see a connection with the educational community. Bridget responded that one of the subgroups is working on the educational component and they are finding that many schools are already including invasive species as part of the curriculum.

YOUTH ATHLETIC FACILITIES GRANT AWARDS

Marguerite Austin and Adam Cole presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #22 for details.)

YAF-Improving Category

Marguerite discussed the specific program policies for the YAF-Improving category.

RCO staff recommends that the Board approve the ranked list established by the Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) Advisory Committee and funding for all 20 projects in the YAF-Improving category. The amount requested is approximately \$1.3 million.

Adam presented the top two projects in the YAF-Improving category:

- #07-1952D Civic Sports Fields Renovation, City of Woodinville
- #07-1815D Ellersick Memorial Soccer Field/Track Project, Pend Oreille County

Bill Chapman **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-018. Dave Brittell **SECONDED**.

Public testimony:

Nancy Ousley, Assistant City Manager for the City of Kenmore, and Bill Evans, Parks Planner for the City of Kenmore, spoke on behalf of the St. Edward Park project. Nancy noted that the project addresses a huge need for playing fields in the city and they have made numerous project design modifications to minimize the impact to the park.

Chair Ogden asked whether the lease agreement was in place.

Bill Evans reported that he is working with State Parks to develop the lease agreement and plans to have it completed within 90 days.

Resolution #2008-018 **APPROVED** as presented. Rex Derr abstained from voting.

YAF-New Category

Marguerite explained that, if signed by the Governor, the 2008-2009 Supplemental Capital Budget will allow the Board to move unused funds from one category to another, potentially increasing the amount available in the YAF-New category to about \$1.7 million.

RCO staff recommends that the Board adopt the ranked list established by the Youth Athletic Facilities Advisory Committee and approve funding for the projects in the YAF-New category. Staff further recommends approval of the remaining eligible projects as alternates. Alternate projects may be funded if additional dollars become available before the next grant round.

Staff also recommends that the Board delegate to the Director the authority to move excess funds from the YAF-Improving and YAF-Maintaining categories to the YAF-New category if the authority to move funds is approved in the supplemental capital budget.

Adam presented the top two projects in the YAF-New category:

- #07-1959D Black Hills Soccer, Black Hills Community Soccer
- #07-1945D Ravensdale Park Synthetic Sportsfield, King County DNR & Parks

Jeff Parsons **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-019. Steven Drew **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-019 **APPROVED** as presented. Rex Derr abstained from voting.

COMPOSITION OF SHB 1651 BOATING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Jim Eychaner presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #24 for details.)

Staff recommends the Board approve a single 15-member advisory committee called the "Boating Programs Advisory Committee" to (1) help guide the Boating Facilities, Boating Infrastructure, and Boating Activities grant programs, (2) participate in RCO boating-related planning and policy development, and (3) provide advice on how to better coordinate and deliver services to boaters.

The staff also recommends that the Director be authorized to appoint members of the committee and that they be composed of recreational boaters from a variety of boating interests and areas around the state, as well as representatives of state and local government boating facility providers.

Jim Eychaner reported that the RCO has received 53 applications for the advisory committee positions. He discussed the proposed composition of the advisory committee:

- 8 representatives of the boating community, balanced for boat type and diversity of geography, gender, age, and affiliation
- 4 representatives from local agencies, ports, and/or Tribes
- 3 representatives from state agencies

Steven asked Jim what kind of feedback he had received concerning the 8-7 ratio between citizens and agencies. Jim commented that there had been preliminary discussions that included other ratios, including a federal representative. The 8-7 ratio came about through an evolutionary process.

Dave Brittell **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-020. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Public testimony:

Marina Hensch, Director of Governmental Affairs for Northwest Marine Trade Association, thanked staff for moving quickly to get the advisory committee going. She feels that having one advisory committee to oversee the three boating programs is a good step. Marina stated that, although her preference was to have only representatives from the boating community on the advisory committee, she is supportive of the new approach. She encouraged the Board to approve the resolution.

Resolution #2008-020 **APPROVED** as presented.

AQUATIC LANDS ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT POLICIES AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #25 for details.)

At the January 15, 2008 meeting, the Board directed staff to amend the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) grant program policies and evaluation criteria to award additional points to projects that address multiple programs goals and seek additional public comment.

RCO staff prepared an amended proposal and distributed it for public comment on January 28, 2008. If approved, the proposed changes would be implemented for the 2008 grant cycle.

Leslie highlighted the proposed policy changes:

- The Board encourages projects that involve both (1) the enhancement, improvement, and protection of aquatic lands, and (2) access to aquatic lands.
- ALEA projects must be adjacent to navigable waters.
- Applicants may receive an additional five points for meeting both protection/enhancement and public access elements in their project.

Jeff concurred with staff's recommendation. Having projects fully evaluated on both protection or enhancement and public access should take care of the balance issue.

Bill Chapman **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-021. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-021 **APPROVED** as presented.

WWRP MITIGATION BANKING PROJECT POLICIES

Leslie Ryan-Connelly presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #26 for details.)

Staff proposed changes to the policies regarding WWRP mitigation bank projects. The proposed changes would affect project eligibility, application requirements, and the evaluation process. The proposal was distributed for public comment.

Leslie highlighted the proposed policy changes:

- Mitigation bank projects are eligible for funding only in the Riparian Protection Account and the Urban Wildlife Habitat and Critical Habitat categories of the Habitat Conservation Account. Applicants compete with all other projects submitted for consideration within the appropriate grant account and category, and use the same evaluation criteria and process.
- Only state and local agencies are eligible to submit mitigation bank projects.
- The Washington Department of Ecology's Mitigation Bank Review Team or other regulatory body overseeing mitigation or conservation banks must approve the mitigation bank.
- WWRP funds that are used for mitigation bank projects can be used only for public purposes.
- Eligible Project Types – Acquisition and/or development or restoration
- All mitigation bank projects funded through WWRP must comply with adopted income generation policies.

Bill believes that the overall effect of these changes to the mitigation banking policies is that no one will use it.

Chair Ogden commented that the whole issue of mitigation banking is coming under reexamination and people are questioning its effectiveness.

Jim Fox talked about how this issue has gotten very complex. In working with the State Treasurer's Office, he has learned that there are federal tax exempt bond restrictions. He noted that the goal for this grant cycle was to give the mitigation banking project requirements a narrow focus until the legal and philosophical issues are resolved.

Jeff commented that he likes the proposed changes because he is not a proponent of the concept of mitigation banking. At some point he would like to have a discussion on where mitigation banking fits more appropriately, as he doesn't feel comfortable with it being part of the WWRP.

Bill agrees that it is probably not a good fit with the WWRP.

Chair Ogden feels that the proposed changes are a good interim step in the process until the issues with mitigation banking become clearer.

Steven Drew **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2008-022. Chair Ogden **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2008-022 **APPROVED** by Board as presented. Jeff Parsons and Bill Chapman opposed.

PRESENTATION ON GRANT PROGRAM ALIGNMENT AND INTERCONNECTEDNESS

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #23 for details.)

Jim provided a PowerPoint presentation entitled "How Does It All Fit Together?" exploring the relationships between RCO's five boards and how their missions are linked. He identified some common themes and concepts such as strategic investment, accountability, biodiversity conservation, and ecosystem-based planning.

Jim stated a major role of this Board is to invest in the highest priority recreation and conservation projects and provide accountability for those investments. The vision is for all of the boards to work together to try to develop a more coordinated strategic landscape and ecosystem-based approach to preservation and enhancement.

Chair Ogden commented on how our strategic plan is one way we can bring it all together and give us a way to make sure we are going in the right direction.

Kaleen pointed out how the policy recommendations necessary to implement the Berk study would go a long way to creating consistency between the RCFB and the SRFB.

POSSIBLE 2009 RCFB REQUEST LEGISLATION

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #27 for details.)

The deadline for submitting agency request legislation to the Governor will be in early-to-mid September. Staff is seeking direction on possible topics and will begin stakeholder outreach and bill drafting on any items the Board would like to pursue.

Staff recommends that the Board discuss the following topics for possible 2009 legislation. At minimum, staff recommends that the Board pursue legislation addressing topic #1.

1. *Population Proximity*: Amend statutes requiring the Board to give preference to parks in or near urban areas.
2. *NOVA program*: Authorize the Board to apply excess NOVA facility dollars to the Education and Enforcement (E&E) category.

3. *WWRP*: Work with the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition to explore:
 - Repealing the authority to fund mitigation banking projects;
 - Providing planning/design grants to allow phasing of projects and giving preference to projects that are “ready to proceed”;
 - Making certain forest land eligible in the Farmland Preservation Program or creating a similar category; and
 - Making nonprofit organizations eligible in one or more categories.
4. *YAF*
 - Give the Board the ability to move excess dollars from one category to another.
 - Amend the requirement that grants be distributed in proportion to population.
5. *Boating*: Identify areas to improve the coordination between the various boating programs in state government (as recommended in the boating needs assessment) and evaluate any related statutory changes.
6. *Firearms and Archery Range Recreation program*: Amend the term requirements for advisory committee members.

Jim noted that staff is open to other ideas.

The Board should decide at its June 2008 meeting whether to submit legislation for the 2009 session.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Approved by:

Val Ogden, Chair

Date

Next meeting: June 19 & 20, 2008
Bellingham

RESOLUTION #2008-010
March 2008 Consent Agenda

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following March 2008, Consent Agenda items are approved:

- a) Approval of RCFB Minutes – January 15, 2008
- b) Time Extensions
 - i. RCO# 01-1160D, Kitsap County Parks and Rec., Veterans Memorial Park 01
 - ii. RCO# 03-1132D, Northwest Maritime Center, NWMC Mooring Buoy & Moorage Floats
 - iii. RCO# 03-1156D, Kitsap County Rifle and Revolver Club, Rifle Line Reorientation and Sound Cover
 - iv. RCO# 02-1303D, Port of Bremerton, Bremerton Marina Breakwater & Moorage
 - v. RCO# 01-1143D, Snohomish County Parks, Lake Stevens Community Fields
- c) Project Type Change
 - i. RCO #04-1346D, Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, Long Lake Public Access
- d) Scope Changes
 - i. RCO #06-1732A, State Parks, Right Smart Cove
- e) Cost Increases
 - i. RCO #02-1248D, Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, Big Lake Boat Launch
 - ii. RCO #04-1232D, State Parks, Camano Island Boat Launch
- f) Conversions
 - i. RCO #66-025A, #69-006A, #92-085A, King County, Multiple Properties (Sammamish River Park, East Green River, and Green River/Cedar River Trail)

Resolution moved by: Rex Derr

Resolution seconded by: Jeff Parsons

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 27, 2008

RESOLUTION #2008-011 (As Amended)
State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria and Process

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) approves policies that govern Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, the State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) wishes to modify the evaluation process and criteria for the State Parks Category of the WWRP to better meet the needs and priorities of the Commission and reduce duplicative staff efforts; and

WHEREAS, at its November 2007 meeting, the Board adopted Resolution 2007-30, Evaluation Process for the State Parks Category, delegating to the Commission the evaluation and ranking of Commission projects; and

WHEREAS, establishing such a process would further the Board's strategic goal to "[e]valuate policies to help clients strategically invest in the protection, restoration, and development of habitat and recreation opportunities"; and

WHEREAS, the RCO staff has solicited and considered public comment on this process;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does hereby direct its staff to implement in the 2008 State Parks WWRP grant cycle using the evaluation criteria and process described in Attachments A and B of the memorandum attached hereto.

Resolution moved by: Steven Drew

Resolution seconded by: Bill Chapman

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 27, 2008

Attachment A:

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program State Parks Category

Proposed Evaluation Process

March 1, 2008

Public Visibility Steps

1. The State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) will review the list of candidate projects at a spring work session. This meeting is open to public, but no public comment is taken.
2. State Parks staff provides the report on the preliminary ranked list to the Commission, which distributes it to the public for comment.
3. State Parks staff requests Commission approval of the final ranked list at the August Commission meeting. This meeting is open to public. Members of the public may comment at the meeting or in writing. State Parks staff provide a summary of written comments for Commission consideration.
4. The Commission submits the list to the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) for final approval and inclusion with the Board's recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature.

Administrative Steps

1. State Parks staff submits projects to the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) by established Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program timelines.
2. RCO staff reviews state parks category projects to determine eligibility before the evaluation.
3. State Parks will identify "top or high" priority projects before the evaluation meeting. High priority projects are projects that have some element of urgency such as matching funds, a strict timeline, or urgency by a willing seller.
4. The state parks category evaluation team has 8 to 10 members. All are State Parks staff, except that one may be a citizen representative. Members include:
 - Assistant Director of Parks Development Service Center
 - Capital Program Manager
 - Planning Program Manager
 - Stewardship Program Manager
 - Two Regional Managers
 - Two Capital Program Regional Managers
 - Program Manager
 - Citizen Representative (e.g., State Parks Foundation, nonprofit, etc.)
5. Applicants make presentations to the evaluation team, which scores all projects. RCO staff observes the evaluation meeting.

6. The evaluation meeting is open to the public. Only authorized representatives of the applicant agency or RCO staff may address the evaluation team and/or presenters.
7. The evaluation team develops the ranked list of projects by using predetermined criteria and recommending high priority projects.

Attachment B

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program State Parks Category

Proposed Evaluation Criteria

State Parks Category

This project category is reserved for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission for acquisition and/or development of state parks.

RCFB Manual 10a.

WWRP - STATE PARKS CRITERIA ANALYSIS						
Score	#	Title	A/D	Multiplier	Maximum Points	Focus
Team	1	Public Need	A/D	1	5.0	State
Team	2	Project Significance	A/D	3	15.0	State Parks
Team	3	Project Design	D	2	10.0	Technical
Team	4	Immediacy of Threat	A	2	10.0	State
Team	5	Expansion / Phased Project	A/D	2	10.0	State
Team	6	Multiple Fund Sources	A/D	1	5.0	State
Team	7	Readiness to Proceed	A/D	1	5.0	State Parks
Team	8	Shows Application of Sustainability	A/D	1	5.0	State Parks
RCO Staff	9	Population Proximity	A/D	1	3.0	State
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE					A= 58 / D= 58	

KEY:

- RCO Staff = Criteria scored by RCO staff
- Team = Criteria scored by interdisciplinary *team*
- A/D = Acquisition or Development specific question
- Mult/Mx = Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
- Focus = *State/State Parks/Technical*; Criteria based on three need factors: those that meet general *statewide* needs (often called for in RCW or the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan), those that specifically meet *State Parks'* needs, and those that meet *technical* considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
PROPOSED SCORING CRITERIA
State Parks

TEAM SCORED CRITERIA

1. **Public Need.** Describe why this facility should be built or property acquired? It is cited in CAMP (Classification and Management Plan - a State Parks Commission-approved comprehensive plan for a park), cited in the current State Parks 10 Year Capital Plan, consistent with State Parks' Centennial 2013 Vision, identified by the public, etc.

No CAMP, Master Plan, not in 10 year capital Plan or Consistent with the 2013 Centennial Vision, no or little public interest (0 points)

In 120 Parks, CAMP approved, in 10 year Capital Plan, some public support, property acquisition listed in CAMP but not essential (1-2 points)

CAMP approved, Master Plan prepared, in 10 year capital plan, property acquisition resolves management problem or needed for capital project or implements Cultural resources Plan/Stewardship Plan (3-5 points)

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

2. **Project Significance.** Describe why this is a project of statewide or regional merit. Is this a 'high priority' project?

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Measure</u>
Significance	Whether the project has traits which relatively few places have, such as listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or that the park contains uncommon natural, cultural, or historic resources, or possesses uncommon recreational attributes and whether State Parks plays an essential role in ensuring that the significant trait(s) are protected, enhanced and made appropriately available to the public.
Popularity	Project at a park with high visitation or that operates at a high percent of capacity
Experience(s)	Number and quality of experience(s) provided
Uniqueness	Unique experience(s) provided
Flora/fauna	Outstanding example of specific habitat for flora and/or fauna in abundance or quality or both
Scenery	Well known for scenic qualities (e.g., cited in tourist brochures as an attractive, popular site for photography or other art, referenced in news articles, etc.)

Size	Has sufficient size to accommodate current and future uses and maintain quality of experience
Condition	Facilities (built environment) add to the visitors' experience

Normally, projects at parks offering a variety of natural resource/cultural resource/recreation resources, particularly in an area with few similar resources will score higher than those offering few or a single opportunity. However, if a single, significant need is identified and strongly met as a single element, the project can score well on this question. For example: acquisition of a rare site for a single purpose recreational opportunity; or natural or cultural resource; or developing facilities that enhance the experience at such a site (e.g., Doug's Beach – wind-surfing launch site, Peshastin Pinnacles – rock climbing, petroglyphs, etc.).

Park not on the 120 park list, capital project or acquisition does not contain significant natural, cultural or recreation attributes (0 points)

Capital project or acquisition provides access to good quality natural, cultural or recreation attributes; noted in 10 year capital plan, CAMP or Master Plan; fills identified void..... (1-3 points)

Capital project or acquisition a priority in Master Plan, 10 year capital plan, essential element in park development, or protects vital resources..... (4-5 points)

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

3. Project Design (development only). Describe how this project demonstrates good site and building design.

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 appropriately made available for recreation? Will environmental or other important values be protected by the proposed development? 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; recreation experiences; aesthetics; maintenance; site suitability; materials; spatial relationships; and user-friendly, universally accessible design, etc.

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

4. Immediacy of Threat (acquisition only). Describe the consequences of not obtaining this land now. Consider the availability of alternatives. Where none exist, the significance of a threat may be higher.

No evidence presented.(0 points)

Minimal threat; site resource opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use in the next 36 months..... (1-2 points)

Actions are under consideration that could result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use(3 points)

Actions will be taken that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use

or

A threat situation has occurred or is imminent and has led a land trust to acquire rights in the land at the request of the applicant agency..... (4-5 points)

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

- 5. Expansion/Phased Project.** Is this a continuation of a previous project? When did the previous project start and end (if applicable)? Is this a distinct stand-alone phase?

Not part of phased plan, or expansion project, or last phase completed more than 4 years ago.....(0 points)

Previous phase completed 2-3 years ago (1-2 points)

A key starting point for a multi-phase project or builds on a project started less than 2 years prior; expands a popular or notable site/facility..... (3-5 points)

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

- 6. Multiple Funding Sources.** Are there multiple funding sources proposed to support this project? A fund source must contribute 5% or more of the total project cost in cash, grants, or in-kind services to qualify as a fund source. No other fund sources (0 points)

One other fund source..... (1-2 points)

More than one other fund source..... (3-4 points)

AND

Sources outside of the state budget receive a point if they exceed 25% of the grant request amount (1 point)

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

- 7. Readiness to Proceed.** Is the project fully designed and permitted (development) or is there a written sales agreement with the property owner (acquisition)? Are there any significant local zoning or permitting issues?

Acquisition: No signed sales agreement with landowner.
Development: Construction drawings less than 60% completed and no permits in-hand (0 points)

Acquisition: Signed sales agreement completed;
Development: All permits in-hand (1-5 points)
Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

8. Application of Sustainability. Does the proposed design or acquisition meet accepted sustainability standards, best management practices, and/or stewardship of natural or cultural resources?

Acquisition: Project provides no evidence of protecting natural or cultural resources.
Development: Project does not demonstrate a high standard of stewardship (e.g., energy conservation, waste reduction, use of sustainable products, etc)(0 points)

Acquisition: Project protects key natural/cultural resources.
Development: Project demonstrates highest standards of stewardship (e.g., energy conservation, waste reduction, use of sustainable products, etc) (1-5 points)

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

SCORED BY RCO STAFF

Proximity to Human Populations. Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities and towns, and county density?

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.25.250 (RCFB and urban area parks)

This question is scored by RCO staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive a score, the map must show the project location and project boundary in relationship to a city's or town's urban growth boundary.

- a. The project is within the urban growth area boundary of a city or town with a population of 5,000 or more.

Yes: 1.5 points

No: 0 points

AND

- b. The project is within a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Yes: 1.5 points

No: 0 points

The result from "a" is added to the result from "b." Projects in cities with a population of more than 5,000 and within high density counties receive points from both "a" and "b."

RCO staff awards a maximum of 3 Revised November 2007

REVISED RESOLUTION #2008-013
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Funding for Farmland Preservation, State Fiscal Year 2009

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) recommended a ranked list of eligible Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program projects to the Governor for inclusion in the 2008 Supplemental Capital Budget, and

WHEREAS, the Governor submitted to the 2008 Legislature the complete list of Board recommended Farmland Preservation projects (state fiscal year 2009) for approval, and

WHEREAS, the 2008 Legislature as part of Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2765 (Supplemental Capital Budget) approved projects contained in LEAP Capital Document No. 2008-1, and

WHEREAS, the 2007-2009 State Capital budget included \$8.7 million for the Farmland Preservation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, and

WHEREAS, \$4.7 million remains available for farmland preservation projects, and

WHEREAS, providing funds to the projects would further the Board's strategic goal to "[f]und the best projects as determined by the evaluation process,"

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board hereby approves funding for the ranked list of projects depicted in Table 1: *Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Farmland Preservation*, State Fiscal Year 2009, contingent on the Governor's signing of ESHB2765, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board authorizes the Director to execute the appropriate agreements for prompt implementation of these projects.

Resolution moved by: Jeff Parsons

Resolution seconded by: Bill Chapman

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 27, 2008



Resolution: 2008-013

**Table 1
WWRP Farmland Preservation Evaluation Ranked List
State Fiscal Year 2009**

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	RCFB Grant Request	Sponsor Match	Total Amount	Cummulative Request	RCO Staff Recommends
1 of 16	111.857	07-1611A	Peoples Ranch	Snohomish County of	\$750,000	\$884,420	\$1,634,420	\$750,000	\$750,000
2 of 16	110.857	07-1540C	Glendale Farm	Jefferson County of	\$546,737	\$546,738	\$1,093,475	\$1,296,737	\$546,737
3 of 16	110.286	07-1600A	Ebey's Reserve Farmland - Engle	Island County of	\$750,000	\$900,200	\$1,650,200	\$2,046,737	\$750,000
4 of 16	109.429	07-1604A	Terry's Berries Farm	Pierce County of	\$291,370	\$291,371	\$582,741	\$2,338,107	\$291,370
5 of 16	109.000	07-1597A	Orting Valley Farms	Pierce County of	\$750,000	\$800,000	\$1,550,000	\$3,088,107	\$750,000
6 of 16	108.571	07-1610A	Willie Greens Organic Farm	Snohomish County of	\$78,210	\$78,210	\$156,420	\$3,166,317	\$78,210
7 of 16	107.429	07-1574A	Rattlesnake Hills Working Rangelands	Yakima County of	\$576,650	\$576,650	\$1,153,300	\$3,742,967	\$576,650
8 of 16	105.286	07-1584A	Useless Bay East Farmland	Island County of	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,242,967	\$500,000
9 of 16	105.000	07-1571A	Crown-S Ranch Farmland	Okanogan County of	\$213,750	\$213,750	\$427,500	\$4,456,717	\$213,750
10 of 16	102.143	07-1607A	Biderbost Farm	Snohomish County of	\$280,710	\$280,710	\$561,420	\$4,737,427	\$280,710
11 of 16	102.000	07-1602A	Triple Creek Ranch	Kittitas County of	\$689,695	\$1,073,705	\$1,763,400	\$5,427,122	Alternate
12 of 16	101.571	07-1556A	Enumclaw Plateau Pasture Land	King County of	\$102,900	\$102,900	\$205,800	\$5,530,022	Alternate
13 of 16	101.000	07-1616A	Pearson Eddy	Snohomish County of	\$203,420	\$203,420	\$406,840	\$5,733,442	Alternate
14 of 16	100.857	07-1596A	Cowiche Basin Working Rangelands -	Yakima County of	\$690,900	\$690,900	\$1,381,800	\$6,424,342	Alternate
15 of 16	99.000	07-1603A	Finn Hall Fam Phase 1	Clallam County of	\$508,475	\$508,475	\$1,016,950	\$6,932,817	Alternate
16 of 16	95.286	07-1612A	Setzer Farm	Snohomish County of	\$20,210	\$20,210	\$40,420	\$6,953,027	Alternate
					\$6,953,027	\$7,671,659	\$14,624,686		\$4,737,427

WWRP Farmland Preservation funds available \$4,737,427

Date Created: 02/29/08

Attachment A

Evaluation Ranked List and Funding Recommendations, NOVA Program Off-Road Vehicle Noise Enforcement, State Fiscal Year 2008

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	RCFB Amt	Sponsor Amt	Total Amt	Cumulative Request	Recommend Funding
1 of 10	59.167	07-1989E	Cle Elum OHV Noise E&E	USFS WNF Cle Elum RD	\$8,565	\$1,248	\$9,813	\$8,565	\$8,565
2 of 10	51.833	07-1986E	Tahuya Event and Weekend ORV Noise E+E	Natural Resources Dept of	\$50,000	\$6,180	\$56,180	\$58,565	\$58,565
3 of 10	51.500	07-1988E	Land Adjacent to Tahuya and Green Mt. State Forest	Natural Resources Dept of	\$50,000	\$7,025	\$57,025	\$108,565	\$108,565
4 of 10	50.750	07-2001E	Naches OHV Noise E & E	USFS WNF Naches RD	\$20,170	\$8,800	\$28,970	\$128,735	\$128,735
5 of 10	50.667	07-1996E	Central Zone OHV Noise E&E	USFS WNF Entiat RD	\$29,015	\$7,900	\$36,915	\$157,750	\$157,750
6 of 10	47.833	07-1998E	City of Republic OHV Education	Republic City of	\$10,000	\$4,500	\$14,500	\$167,750	\$167,750
7 of 10	46.667	07-1991E	Spokane County Parks Noise Enforcement Program	Spokane County Parks & Rec	\$32,780	\$1,300	\$34,080	\$200,530	\$200,530
8 of 10	45.583	07-1990E	POV Sound Enforcement Ranger	USFS CNF Newport RD	\$50,000	\$3,000	\$53,000	\$250,530	\$250,530
9 of 10	44.917	07-1985E	Chelan County Sheriff ORV Noise Enforcement	Chelan County Sheriffs Office	\$49,155	\$6,000	\$55,155	\$299,685	\$299,685
10 of 10	41.417	07-2002E	Grant County ORV Noise Enforcement	Grant County Sheriff Dept	\$13,540		\$13,540	\$313,225	\$313,225
					\$313,225	\$45,953	\$359,178		

RESOLUTION #2008-015 (As Amended)
**POLICY FOR ALLOCATING EXCESS NONHIGHWAY AND
OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ACTIVITIES (NOVA) PROGRAM FUNDS**

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) wants to award NOVA funds to projects in a timely manner and reduce the amount of money carried forward to the next grant cycle; and

WHEREAS, doing so will help ensure the funds improve recreational opportunities as soon as possible while reducing the risk that the funds will be diverted to other programs; and

WHEREAS, the Board and the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) have developed processes that should help reduce the amount of the unobligated funds carried forward to future grant cycles; and

WHEREAS, establishing such a process would further the Board's strategic goal to "[e]nsure funded projects and programs are managed efficiently"; and

WHEREAS, the RCO staff has solicited and considered public comment on these proposed processes;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board will allocate funds in the following sequence, as described in the memorandum attached hereto, beginning with the 2008 grants cycle:

1. Apply returned funds to the next ranked project and add any remaining funds to the competitive pool.
2. Expand the criteria for allocating competitive dollars and award them after awarding ORV permit dollars.
3. Allocate any current year excess funds to other categories using the same criteria used to allocate competitive dollars
4. Add any remaining unobligated funds to the competitive dollars in the next grant cycle.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that beginning with the 2009-2011 biennium, the RCFB will allocate 70% of the NOVA recreation category dollars in the first grant cycle of the biennium and the remaining funds in the second cycle.

Resolution moved by: Steven Drew

Resolution seconded by: Jeff Chapman

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 27, 2008

RESOLUTION #2008-016
POLICY FOR ALLOCATING UNCOMMITTED
NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (NRTP) FUNDS

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) is sometimes challenged in meeting the minimum federal fund allocation percentage requirements for National Recreational Trails Program (NRTP) grant categories; and

WHEREAS, there may not be enough applications submitted to one or more NRTP categories to make use of available funding in those categories; and

WHEREAS, the Board wants to allocate NRTP funds to eligible projects in a timely manner; and

WHEREAS, the RCO staff has developed the process described in the memorandum attached hereto that should reduce the amount of unobligated funds carried over to future grant cycles; and

WHEREAS, establishing such a process would further the Board's strategic goal to "[e]nsure funded projects and programs are managed efficiently"; and

WHEREAS, the RCO staff has solicited and considered public comment on this process;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does hereby direct its staff to implement in the 2008 NRTP grant cycle the process described in the memorandum attached hereto.

Resolution moved by: Craig Partridge

Resolution seconded by: Steven Drew

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 27, 2008

RESOLUTION #2008-018
Youth Athletic Facilities - Improving Category
Funding for State Fiscal Year 2008

WHEREAS, twenty Youth Athletic Facilities Improving category projects are submitted for State Fiscal Year 2008 funding consideration, and

WHEREAS, all 20 Improving category projects were evaluated against an evaluation instrument approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board), and

WHEREAS, all Youth Athletic Facilities Improving category projects meet program requirements as stipulated in statute and Manual #17, *Youth Athletic Facilities: 2007-08 Policies and Project Selection*, and

WHEREAS, the Youth Athletic Facilities Advisory Committee recommends adoption of the ranked list and approval of project funding as shown in *Table 1 - Youth Athletic Facilities Improving Category, State Fiscal Year 2008 Funding*, and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution implements strategy 3.21 of the *Recreation and Conservation Office 2007-2011 Strategic Plan* to provide grants to acquire develop and renovate Youth Athletic Facilities in urban areas;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby approves the ranked list and fiscal year 2008 funding for Youth Athletic Facilities Improving category projects as depicted in *Table 1 - Youth Athletic Facilities Improving Category, State Fiscal Year 2008 Funding (2008-018)*, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director be authorized to execute project agreements necessary to facilitate prompt project implementation.

Resolution moved by: Bill Chapman

Resolution seconded by: Dave Brittell

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 28, 2008



**Table 1
Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) - Improving Category
State Fiscal Year 2008**

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	YAF Grant Amount	Sponsor Amount	Total Amount	Cumulative Request	Recommended Funding
1 of 20	53.625	07-1952D	Civic Sports Fields Renovation YAF	Woodinville City of	\$75,000	\$3,029,564	\$3,104,564	\$75,000	\$75,000
2 of 20	49.125	07-1815D	Ellersick Memorial Soccer Field / Track	Pend Oreille County of	\$75,000	\$109,717	\$184,717	\$150,000	\$75,000
3 of 20	48.250	07-1934D	West Ellensburg Park Softball Lighting	Ellensburg Parks & Rec Dept	\$75,000	\$175,000	\$250,000	\$225,000	\$75,000
4 of 20	47.625	07-1949D	Brannan Park Field Lighting	Auburn City of	\$75,000	\$108,845	\$183,845	\$300,000	\$75,000
5 of 20	47.375	07-1903D	Asotin County Fields Phase II: Field Lights	Asotin County Little League	\$44,630	\$58,800	\$103,430	\$344,630	\$44,630
5 of 20	47.375	07-1647D	Strawberry Multi-Use Community Fields	Poulsbo/N Kitsap Parks & Rec	\$75,000	\$996,557	\$1,071,557	\$419,630	\$75,000
7 of 20	46.750	07-1905D	Des Moines Field House Park Field #1	Des Moines City of	\$75,000	\$145,862	\$220,862	\$494,630	\$75,000
8 of 20	46.125	07-1920D	St. Edwards State Park Field Improvement	Kenmore City of	\$75,000	\$231,741	\$306,741	\$569,630	\$75,000
9 of 20	45.875	07-1723D	Strawberry Fields Improvement	Marysville City of	\$50,000	\$58,340	\$108,340	\$619,630	\$50,000
10 of 20	45.375	07-1935D	Badger Mountain Park Field Lighting	Richland Parks & Rec	\$75,000	\$95,000	\$170,000	\$694,630	\$75,000
11 of 20	45.250	07-1793D	Battle Point Park Development Phase II	Bainbridge Island Soccer Club	\$75,000	\$587,351	\$662,351	\$769,630	\$75,000
12 of 20	42.500	07-1862D	Sky River Park Sportsfields Drainage	Monroe City of	\$75,000	\$225,000	\$300,000	\$844,630	\$75,000
13 of 20	41.875	07-1958D	Volunteer Park Field # 1 Renovation	Key Peninsula Little League	\$75,000	\$112,860	\$187,860	\$919,630	\$75,000
14 of 20	39.500	07-1780D	Mason County Recreation Area Improvements	Mason County	\$28,000	\$30,000	\$58,000	\$947,630	\$28,000
15 of 20	39.375	07-1818D	Vashon Athletic Field Improvements Phase I	Vashon Youth Baseball/Softball	\$75,000	\$160,450	\$235,450	\$1,022,630	\$75,000
15 of 20	39.375	07-1715D	South Whidbey Soccer Field Improvements	South Whidbey Youth Soccer	\$75,000	\$273,726	\$348,726	\$1,097,630	\$75,000
17 of 20	39.125	07-1778D	Sandhill Park Field Renovation	Mason County	\$44,000	\$47,000	\$91,000	\$1,141,630	\$44,000
18 of 20	33.125	07-1968D	Benton City Community Basketball Court	Benton City of	\$62,500	\$62,500	\$125,000	\$1,204,130	\$62,500
19 of 20	32.625	07-1937D	Bowen Field Lighting	Sumas City of	\$75,000	\$98,420	\$173,420	\$1,279,130	\$75,000
19 of 20	32.625	07-1927D	Beerbower Park Renovation	McCleary City of	\$60,938	\$60,938	\$121,876	\$1,340,068	\$60,938
					1,340,068	6,667,671	8,007,739		1,340,068

YAF-Improving category 2008 funds available are \$1,513,988. This includes the \$1,213,250 appropriation, \$91,400 from interest on funds in the YAF account, and \$191,338 in uncommitted funds. Full funding of projects 1-20 leaves an unused balance of \$173,920. Staff recommends using this balance for YAF New category projects, subject to authority granted in the supplemental capital budget.

RESOLUTION #2008-019
Youth Athletic Facilities - New Category
Funding for State Fiscal Year 2008

WHEREAS, twenty-five Youth Athletic Facilities New category projects are submitted for State Fiscal Year 2008 funding consideration, and

WHEREAS, all 25 Youth Athletic Facilities New category projects were evaluated against an evaluation instrument approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board), and

WHEREAS, 24 Youth Athletic Facilities New category projects meet program requirements as stipulated in statute and Manual #17, *Youth Athletic Facilities: 2007-08 Policies and Project Selection*, and

WHEREAS, the Youth Athletic Facilities Advisory Committee recommends adoption of the ranked list and approval of project funding as shown in *Table 1 - Youth Athletic Facilities New Category, State Fiscal Year 2008 Funding (2008-019)*, and

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution implements strategy 3.21 of the *Recreation and Conservation Office 2007-2011 Strategic Plan* to provide grants to acquire develop and renovate Youth Athletic Facilities in urban areas;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby adopts the ranked list and approves funding for Youth Athletic Facilities New category projects as depicted in *Table 1 - Youth Athletic Facilities New Category, State Fiscal Year 2008 Funding (2008-019)*, subject to statutory authority to move unused funds from other Youth Athletic Facilities grant categories, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director is authorized to shift excess funds from the Improving and Maintaining categories to the New category if the supplemental capital budget, ESHB2765, is signed by the Governor.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Director be authorized to execute project agreements necessary to facilitate prompt project implementation.

Resolution moved by: Jeff Parsons

Resolution seconded by: Steven Drew

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 28, 2008

**Table 1
Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) - New Category
State Fiscal Year 2008**

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	YAF Grant Amount	Sponsor Amount	Total Amount	Cumulative Request	Recommended Funding
1 of 25	50.286	07-1959D	Blackhills Soccer	Black Hills Community Soccer	\$105,000	\$115,000	\$220,000	\$105,000	\$105,000
2 of 25	48.571	07-1945D	Ravensdale Park Synthetic Sportsfield	King County DNR & Parks	\$150,000	\$1,675,000	\$1,825,000	\$255,000	\$150,000
3 of 25	48.000	07-1753D	Squak Valley Park South	Issaquah City of	\$100,000	\$875,159	\$975,159	\$355,000	\$100,000
4 of 25	47.571	07-1970D	Rainier Vista Playfield	Boys & Girls Clubs of King Co	\$150,000	\$852,216	\$1,002,216	\$505,000	\$150,000
5 of 25	46.857	07-1944D	West Ellensburg Park Field Construction	Ellensburg Parks & Rec Dept	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000	\$655,000	\$150,000
6 of 25	46.429	07-1836D	SPARK Sports Park	Northwest Parks Foundation	\$150,000	\$563,819	\$713,819	\$805,000	\$150,000
7 of 25	46.000	07-1992D	St. Edwards State Park Field New	Kenmore City of	\$150,000	\$568,259	\$718,259	\$955,000	\$150,000
8 of 25	45.429	07-1999D	Asotin County Fields Phase II: T-Ball Field	Asotin County Little League	\$69,846	\$75,000	\$144,846	\$1,024,846	\$69,846
9 of 25	43.857	07-1929D	George Schmid Ball Fields	Washougal City of	\$150,000	\$173,192	\$323,192	\$1,174,846	\$150,000
10 of 25	43.571	07-1850D	Kelso Rotary Skate Park	Kelso City of	\$150,000	\$255,836	\$405,836	\$1,324,846	\$150,000
11 of 25	43.286	07-1711D	Gratzer Ballfields	Orting City of	\$150,000	\$195,000	\$345,000	\$1,474,846	Alternate
12 of 25	42.857	07-1951D	Sixty Acres South Soccer Complex	King County DNR & Parks	\$150,000	\$330,730	\$480,730	\$1,624,846	Alternate
13 of 25	42.571	07-1963D	Liberty Lake Skate Park	Liberty Lake City of	\$86,197	\$89,716	\$175,913	\$1,711,043	Alternate
14 of 25	42.429	07-1779D	Lions Park Soccer Fields	Wapato City of	\$107,600	\$112,000	\$219,600	\$1,818,643	Alternate
14 of 25	42.429	07-1796D	Amy Yee Tennis Center Outdoor Court	Seattle Parks & Rec Dept	\$150,000	\$317,000	\$467,000	\$1,968,643	Alternate
16 of 25	41.143	07-1974D	Malaga Community Park	Chelan County	\$138,964	\$138,964	\$277,928	\$2,107,607	Alternate
17 of 25	40.857	07-1755D	West Fenwick Basketball Court	Kent Parks, Rec & Comm Serv	\$75,000	\$251,569	\$326,569	\$2,182,607	Alternate
18 of 25	40.286	07-1860D	College Marketplace Multipurpose Fields	Poulsbo/N Kitsap Parks & Rec	\$150,000	\$154,119	\$304,119	\$2,332,607	Alternate
19 of 25	38.143	07-1942D	Ace of Hearts Baseball/Fastpitch Field	Anacortes Parks & Rec Dept	\$52,500	\$55,800	\$108,300	\$2,385,107	Alternate
20 of 25	37.571	07-1924D	Cheney Hoop it Up	Cheney City of	\$35,600	\$37,200	\$72,800	\$2,420,707	Alternate
21 of 25	37.143	07-1730D	Lauzier Sports Complex Tennis Court	Quincy City of	\$145,356	\$151,289	\$296,645	\$2,566,063	Alternate
22 of 25	35.286	07-1806D	Battle Ground Sports Complex	Battle Ground City of	\$150,000	\$209,262	\$359,262	\$2,716,063	\$0
23 of 25	35.143	07-1950D	Duthie Hill Mountain Bike Race Park	King County DNR & Parks	\$150,000	\$226,100	\$376,100	\$2,866,063	Alternate
24 of 25	34.857	07-1726D	Benton City Community Aquatic Park	Benton City of	\$150,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,950,000	\$3,016,063	Alternate
25 of 25	31.286	07-1930D	Torguson Park Climbing Rock	North Bend City of	\$83,000	\$83,500	\$166,500	\$3,099,063	Alternate
					3,099,063	9,455,730	12,554,793		1,324,846

YAF-New category 2008 funds available are \$1,333,083. This includes the \$1,213,250 appropriation, \$91,400 from interest on the bonds, and \$10,433 in uncommitted funds. Full funding of projects 1-10 leaves an unused balance of \$8,237.

**Table 2
Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) - New Category
State Fiscal Year 2008**

Rank	Score	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	YAF Grant Amount	Sponsor Amount	Total Amount	Cumulative Request	Recommended Funding
1 of 25	50.286	07-1959D	Blackhills Soccer	Black Hills Community Soccer	\$105,000	\$115,000	\$220,000	\$105,000	\$105,000
2 of 25	48.571	07-1945D	Ravensdale Park Synthetic Sportsfield	King County DNR & Parks	\$150,000	\$1,675,000	\$1,825,000	\$255,000	\$150,000
3 of 25	48.000	07-1753D	Squak Valley Park South	Issaquah City of	\$100,000	\$875,159	\$975,159	\$355,000	\$100,000
4 of 25	47.571	07-1970D	Rainier Vista Playfield	Boys & Girls Clubs of King Co	\$150,000	\$852,216	\$1,002,216	\$505,000	\$150,000
5 of 25	46.857	07-1944D	West Ellensburg Park Field Construction	Ellensburg Parks & Rec Dept	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$300,000	\$655,000	\$150,000
6 of 25	46.429	07-1836D	SPARK Sports Park	Northwest Parks Foundation	\$150,000	\$563,819	\$713,819	\$805,000	\$150,000
7 of 25	46.000	07-1992D	St. Edwards State Park Field New	Kenmore City of	\$150,000	\$568,259	\$718,259	\$955,000	\$150,000
8 of 25	45.429	07-1999D	Asotin County Fields Phase II: T-Ball Field	Asotin County Little League	\$69,846	\$75,000	\$144,846	\$1,024,846	\$69,846
9 of 25	43.857	07-1929D	George Schmid Ball Fields	Washougal City of	\$150,000	\$173,192	\$323,192	\$1,174,846	\$150,000
10 of 25	43.571	07-1850D	Kelso Rotary Skate Park	Kelso City of	\$150,000	\$255,836	\$405,836	\$1,324,846	\$150,000
11 of 25	43.286	07-1711D	Gratzer Ballfields	Orting City of	\$150,000	\$195,000	\$345,000	\$1,474,846	\$150,000
12 of 25	42.857	07-1951D	Sixty Acres South Soccer Complex	King County DNR & Parks	\$150,000	\$330,730	\$480,730	\$1,624,846	\$150,000
13 of 25	42.571	07-1963D	Liberty Lake Skate Park	Liberty Lake City of	\$86,197	\$89,716	\$175,913	\$1,711,043	\$86,197
14 of 25	42.429	07-1779D	Lions Park Soccer Fields	Wapato City of	\$107,600	\$112,000	\$219,600	\$1,818,643	Alternate
14 of 25	42.429	07-1796D	Amy Yee Tennis Center Outdoor Court	Seattle Parks & Rec Dept	\$150,000	\$317,000	\$467,000	\$1,968,643	Alternate
16 of 25	41.143	07-1974D	Malaga Community Park	Chelan County	\$138,964	\$138,964	\$277,928	\$2,107,607	Alternate
17 of 25	40.857	07-1755D	West Fenwick Basketball Court	Kent Parks, Rec & Comm Serv	\$75,000	\$251,569	\$326,569	\$2,182,607	Alternate
18 of 25	40.286	07-1860D	College Marketplace Multipurpose Fields	Poulsbo/N Kitsap Parks & Rec	\$150,000	\$154,119	\$304,119	\$2,332,607	Alternate
19 of 25	38.143	07-1942D	Ace of Hearts Baseball/Fastpitch Field	Anacortes Parks & Rec Dept	\$52,500	\$55,800	\$108,300	\$2,385,107	Alternate
20 of 25	37.571	07-1924D	Cheney Hoop it Up	Cheney City of	\$35,600	\$37,200	\$72,800	\$2,420,707	Alternate
21 of 25	37.143	07-1730D	Lauzier Sports Complex Tennis Court	Quincy City of	\$145,356	\$151,289	\$296,645	\$2,566,063	Alternate
22 of 25	35.286	07-1806D	Battle Ground Sports Complex	Battle Ground City of	\$150,000	\$209,262	\$359,262	\$2,716,063	\$0
23 of 25	35.143	07-1950D	Duthie Hill Mountain Bike Race Park	King County DNR & Parks	\$150,000	\$226,100	\$376,100	\$2,866,063	Alternate
24 of 25	34.857	07-1726D	Benton City Community Aquatic Park	Benton City of	\$150,000	\$1,800,000	\$1,950,000	\$3,016,063	Alternate
25 of 25	31.286	07-1930D	Torguson Park Climbing Rock	North Bend City of	\$83,000	\$83,500	\$166,500	\$3,099,063	Alternate
					3,099,063	9,455,730	12,554,793	1,711,043	

YAF-New category 2008 funds available are \$1,715,191. This includes the \$1,213,250 appropriation, \$91,400 from interest on the bonds, and \$10,433 in uncommitted funds, available from Improving category \$173,920, and available funds from Maintaining category \$208,188. Full funding of projects 1-13 leaves an unused balance of \$4,148.

NOTE: Battle Ground Sports Complex, sponsor unable to provide match.

Prepared: 02/29/2008

RESOLUTION #2008-021

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account – Proposed Revisions

WHEREAS, Chapter 79.105.150 RCW established the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) and grant program, further defined in Chapter 520, Laws of 2007 (uncodified); and

WHEREAS, the Board desires to incorporate changes to the ALEA policy manual; and

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

WHEREAS, final adoption of this policy revision will be incorporated into Manual 21: *Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Grant Program: 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 policy manual and evaluation instrument for the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account grant program be revised as shown in memo topic #25 and Attachment B; 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: Jeff Parsons

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 28, 2008

Attachment B: Changes Proposed for the ALEA Evaluation Instrument and Scoring Criteria

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Evaluation Question Summary #1 Projects Meeting the Single Purpose of Protection or Enhancement

The ALEA program strives to fund projects focused on two main program purposes:

- Improve or protect aquatic lands for public purposes (protection and enhancement), or
- Provide and improve public access to aquatic lands

(RCW 79.105.150(1))

Projects that meet the single program purpose of protecting or enhancing aquatic lands should address those annotated elements within each question under the heading *Protection or Enhancement Projects* for criteria 1 through 3, and 4b, and all elements for criteria 4a and 5.

Score	#	Question	Evaluators Score	Multiplier	Maximum Points
Team	1	Fit with ALEA Program Goals	0-5	3	15
Team	2	Project Need	0-5	4	20
Team	3	Site Suitability	0-5	2	10
Team	4a	Urgency and Viability <i>(acquisition projects only)</i>	0-5	2	10
OR					
Team	4b	Project Design and Viability <i>(restoration and development projects only)</i>	0-5	2	10
Team	5	Community Involvement and Support	0-5	2	10
RCO Staff	6	GMA Preference	0	1	0
RCO Staff	7	Proximity to People	0-1	1	1
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS					66

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

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Evaluation Question Summary #2 Projects Meeting the Single Purpose of Public Access

The ALEA program strives to fund projects focused on two main program purposes:

- Improve or protect aquatic lands for public purposes (protection and enhancement), or
- Provide and improve public access to aquatic lands

(RCW 79.105.150(1))

Projects meeting the single program purpose of providing or improving public access to aquatic lands should address those annotated elements under the heading *Public Access Projects* for criteria 1 through 3 and 4b, and all elements for criteria 4a and 5.

Score	#	Question	Evaluators Score	Multiplier	Maximum Points
Team	1	Fit with ALEA Program Goals	0-5	3	15
Team	2	Project Need	0-5	4	20
Team	3	Site Suitability	0-5	2	10
Team	4a	Urgency and Viability <i>(acquisition projects only)</i>	0-5	2	10
OR					
Team	4b	Project Design and Viability <i>(restoration and development projects only)</i>	0-5	2	10
Team	5	Community Involvement and Support	0-5	2	10
RCO Staff	6	GMA Preference	0	1	0
RCO Staff	7	Proximity to People	0-1	1	1
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS					66

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

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Evaluation Question Summary #3
Projects Meeting Both Program Purposes
Protection or Enhancement AND Public Access Projects

The ALEA program strives to fund projects focused on two main program purposes:

- Improve or protect aquatic lands for public purposes (protection and enhancement), or
- Provide and improve public access to aquatic lands

(RCW 79.105.150(1))

Applicants whose projects meet both program purposes of protecting or enhancing aquatic lands and providing or improving public access to aquatic lands should address all elements for each criterion.

Score	#	Question	Elements	Score	Multiplier	Maximum Points	Total Points
Team	1	Fit with ALEA Program Goals	Protection or Enhancement Elements	0-5	1.5 2	7.5 10	45 <u>20</u>
			Public Access Elements	0-5	1.5 2	7.5 10	
Team	2	Project Need	Protection or Enhancement Elements	0-5	2	10	20
			Public Access Elements	0-5	2	10	
Team	3	Site Suitability	Protection or Enhancement Elements	0-5	1	5	10
			Public Access Elements	0-5	1	5	
Team	4a	Urgency and Viability <i>(acquisition projects only)</i>	All Elements	0-5	2	10	10
OR							
Team	4b	Project Design and Viability <i>(restoration and development projects only)</i>	Protection or Enhancement Elements	0-5	1	5	10
			Public Access Elements	0-5	1	5	
Team	5	Community Involvement and Support	All Elements	0-5	2	10	10
RCO	6	GMA Preference	All Elements	0	1	0	0
RCO	7	Proximity to People	All Elements	0-1	1	1	1
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS						<u>66</u> 71	<u>66</u> 71

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

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account SCORING CRITERIA

The ALEA program strives to fund projects that enhance, improve or protect aquatic lands for public purposes and provide and improve public access to aquatic lands (RCW 79.105.150(1)). The scoring criteria are weighted so that aquatic land protection and enhancement related projects and aquatic land public access related projects have equal scoring opportunities. Applicants respond to protection and enhancement questions or public access questions or both depending upon the type of proposal.

1. Fit with ALEA Program Goals.

How well does this project fit the ALEA program goals to enhance, improve or protect aquatic lands and provide public access to aquatic lands? (RCW 79.105.150)

Additional guidance on ALEA program goals and objectives are in Section 1 of this manual [Manual #21, *ALEA Grant Program: Policies and Selection Criteria*].

PROTECTION OR ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

How will this project:

- Protect existing high value aquatic land that will contribute to important ecological functions and processes?
- Improve the ecological function of aquatic resources through the restoration and enhancement of critical marine, estuarine, and freshwater aquatic land?
- Preserve or establish naturally self-sustaining aquatic and riparian areas that are a high priority in the larger ecological landscape?
- What are the environmental benefits of the proposed project? *RCW 79.105.150(2) and Chapter 520 Laws of 2007.*

PUBLIC ACCESS PROJECTS

How will this project:

- Provide new opportunities for people to get to the water and access aquatic resources for recreational and educational purposes?
- Renovate or improve existing public access to aquatic lands for recreational and educational use?
- Create non-motorized boating and pedestrian-oriented access to aquatic lands that is designed to protect the integrity of the environment?
- Integrate public access in a way that is compatible with the physical features of the site?

- Increase public awareness of aquatic lands as a finite natural resource with irreplaceable public heritage?
- What are the environmental benefits of the proposed project? RCW 79.105.150(2) and Chapter 520 Laws of 2007.

Evaluators score 0-5 points for protection and enhancement only projects or public access only projects. The total score is multiplied by 3 for a total of 15 possible points. If the project includes both protection and enhancement and public access elements, evaluators score 0-5 for protection and enhancement questions and 0-5 for public access questions. The total score is multiplied by 4.5 2.0 for a total of 45-20 possible points.

2. Project Need.

What is the need for this project?

PROTECTION OR ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

- How does the project address priorities contained in an approved watershed plan, shoreline master plan, species recovery plan, or other state or local plan? Is it mentioned specifically in the plan?
- How does it enhance or complement other nearby protection and enhancement efforts in the watershed or on the shoreline?
- How is the need for this project supported in studies, surveys, and other analyses?
- Will the project benefit sensitive, threatened or endangered species or critical plant and animal communities? If so, how?

PUBLIC ACCESS PROJECTS

- Does the project address the priorities contained in an approved public access recreational plan or other state or local plan? Is it mentioned specifically in the plan?
- How is the need for this project supported in studies, surveys, and other analysis?
- How does this project provide opportunities for unserved or underserved recreational need, especially for water dependent uses?
- Does the project include interpretive or educational elements?

Evaluators score 0-5 points for protection and enhancement only or public access only projects. The total score is multiplied by 4 for a total of 20 possible points. If the project includes both protection and enhancement and public access elements evaluators score 0-5 for protection and enhancement questions and 0-5 for public access questions. The total score is multiplied by 2 for a total of 20 possible points.

3. Site Suitability.

Is the site well suited for the intended uses?

PROTECTION OR ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

- Are the location and natural features of the site, for example the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities well suited for the intended uses?
- What are the historic and current human uses of the site?
- What are the historic and current ecological functions of the site?
- What steps have been taken to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts to the site once it has been acquired, restored, or enhanced? Possible impacts to address could include flooding, extreme tides, storm events, sources of contamination, and long-term impacts due to development and climate change.
- Are there sites available in or near the area that provide a similar opportunity or is this property a one-of-a-kind opportunity to address an ecological need?
- Is the site size and configuration sufficient to meet the specified ecological goals on its own? Possible things to address include water quantity and flow patterns at the site, patch size and shape, edge and interior habitat, corridors.
- Is the site contiguous with other conservation areas or actions that address similar ecological functions and processes?

PUBLIC ACCESS PROJECTS

- Are the location and natural features of the site, for example the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, well suited for the intended uses?
- What are the historic and current human uses of the site?
- What are the historic and current ecological functions of the site?
- What steps have been taken to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts to the site once it has been acquired or developed? Possible impacts to address could include flooding, extreme tides, storm events, sources of contamination, and long-term impacts due to development and climate change.
- Are there sites available in or near the area that provide similar access opportunities, or is this property a unique opportunity to address a specific access need?
- Can the site support facilities necessary for the intended type and quantity of use?
- Is the site of adequate size to accommodate the facilities proposed?

Evaluators score 0-5 points for protection and enhancement only or public access only projects. The total score is multiplied by 2 for a total of 10 possible points. If the project

includes both protection and enhancement and public access elements evaluators score 0-5 for protection and enhancement questions and 0-5 for public access questions for a total of 10 possible points. There is no multiplier.

4a. Urgency and Viability:

Only acquisition projects answer this question.

All Acquisition Projects:

Why purchase this particular property at this time? How viable are the anticipated future uses and benefits of the site?

- If ALEA funding is not made available, will high priority aquatic land habitat and/or public access be lost?
- What are the alternatives to acquiring the property?
- Is there an immediate threat or will the property be available for acquisition or enhancement at a later time?
- What is the likelihood that the property will be converted to a non-recreational use or that aquatic habitat resources will be impacted or lost if the property is not acquired now?
- Is there a threat to the public availability of the resources at the site?
- Will the site be available immediately for public use or will the site require some improvement to make it available for public use? If improvements are necessary, what is the timeframe for implementing future site improvements?
- What is the nature and condition of existing surrounding land use as well as future factors such as shoreline designation, zoning, comprehensive or project-specific planning that may impact the viability of the site?
- Describe land management practices in the area that may affect the viability of the site?
- Who will maintain the site and what resources are necessary and available for maintenance for the site?

Evaluators score 0-5 points for all project types. The total score for all project types is multiplied by 2 for a total of 10 possible points.

4b. Project Design and Viability:

Only restoration and enhancement projects, public access development projects, or combination projects answer this question.

Restoration and Enhancement Projects

How does the project address the stated restoration or enhancement need? Is the project well designed? Will the project lead to sustainable ecological functions and processes over time?

- How will the site be treated to re-establish the desired ecological processes and functions?
- What habitat functions will be enhanced or restored?
- How well does the proposed restoration or enhancement design or actions address desired long-term results?
- What is the certainty that the restoration or enhancement actions will be successful?
- Will the project require decreasing involvement over time?
- What is the habitat quality and land management practices in the area that may affect the viability of the site?
- What is the nature and condition of existing surrounding land use as well as future concerns such as shoreline designation, zoning, comprehensive or project-specific planning?
- How will the site be managed over time to maintain the desired ecological processes and functions?
- Who will maintain the site and what resources are necessary and available to do it?

Public Access Projects

How well does the project address the stated public access need? Is the project well designed? Will the project result in public access to aquatic lands that protect the integrity of the environment?

Some design elements that may be considered include accuracy of cost estimate, aesthetics, maintenance requirements, materials, phasing, risk management, recreational experience, spatial relationships, universal accessibility, and user friendly/~~barrier-free~~ design.

- Does the project demonstrate good design criteria; does it make the best use of the site?
- Does the design provide for equal access to disabled persons and persons with limited abilities for all persons including those with disabilities?
- Does the proposed development protect the natural resources on site? For example, does the project include low impact development techniques, green infrastructure, or environmentally preferred building products?
- How the site design is visually integrated into the landscape features?
- How will the site be designed to handle projected use?

- What is the nature and condition of existing surrounding land use as well as future concerns such as shoreline designation, zoning, comprehensive or project-specific planning?
- How likely are the proposed public use facilities given the required regulatory and proprietary approvals, funding, etc?
- Who will maintain the site and what resources are necessary and available to do it?
- What outdoor environmental education elements are included in the project?
- How much effort is dedicated to interpreting the value of the aquatic lands?
- Are the themes or concepts appropriate to the specific site?
- Does the content in the display match the intended audience?
- Is the interpretive display accessible to wide variety of users?

Evaluators score 0-5 points for protection and enhancement only or public access only projects. The total score is multiplied by 2 for a total of 10 possible points. If the project includes both protection and enhancement and public access elements evaluators score 0-5 for protection and enhancement questions and 0-5 for public access questions for a total of 10 possible points. There is no multiplier.

5. Community Involvement and Support.

All Projects

To what extent has the community been provided with an adequate opportunity to become informed about the project and provide input? What is the level of community support for the project?

Examples of community involvement may include public meetings, notices in local papers, newsletters, media coverage, and/or involvement in a local planning process that includes the specific project.

Examples of community support may include voter approved initiatives, bond issues, or referenda; endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user or "friends" groups; letters; letters to the editor; and/or private contributions to the project.

Evaluators score 0-5 points for all projects. The score is multiplied by 2 for a total of 10 possible points.

SCORED BY RCO STAFF *All projects*

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 applicant¹ 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 applicants¹ that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant¹ 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.

A request from an applicant¹ planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (2) over a request from an applicant¹ not planning under this state law.

This question is determined by RCO staff based on information obtained from the state Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development (Growth Management Services). To qualify for the current grant cycle, the GMA comprehensive plan and development regulations must be completed by RCO’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 state, Tribal, or federal agency (0 points)

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

¹ County, city, town, and special district applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to state agency applicants.

SCORED BY RCO STAFF *All projects*

7. Proximity to People.

RCO is required by law to give funding preference to projects located in populated areas. Populated areas are defined 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. *RCW 79A.25.250*

Is the project located in an area meeting this definition?

No..... 0 points

Yes 1 point

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

RESOLUTION #2008-022
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Mitigation Bank Project Policies

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

WHEREAS, RCW 79A.15.060 and .120 allows funding of mitigation bank projects in the Riparian Protection Account and the critical habitat and urban wildlife habitat categories of the Habitat Conservation Account of the WWRP; and

WHEREAS, the Board wants to develop policies regarding the application and evaluation of mitigation bank projects; and

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

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

WHEREAS, adoption of this resolution furthers the Recreation and Conservation Office 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 Board adopts the policies for mitigation bank projects as summarized in Attachment A; and

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

Resolution moved by: Steven Drew

Resolution seconded by: Val Ogden

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 28, 2008

Attachment A: Summary of Proposed Changes to Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Mitigation Bank Policies

Mitigation Bank Projects

Mitigation bank projects are eligible for funding only in the Riparian Protection Account and the urban wildlife habitat and critical habitat categories of the Habitat Conservation Account. Applicants compete with all other projects submitted for consideration within the appropriate grant account and category, and use the same evaluation criteria and process.

Eligible Applicants

Only state and local agencies are eligible to submit mitigation bank projects.

Eligible Projects

The Washington Department of Ecology's Mitigation Bank Review Team or other regulatory body overseeing mitigation or conservation banks must approve the mitigation bank. An applicant may apply for funds before securing approval, but approval must be in place before the Board's final funding decision. Applicants must submit the approved or pending Mitigation Bank Instrument (MBI) with their application. Those applying for development or restoration funds may include design and permit expenses incurred per existing RCFB policy on reimbursement of eligible pre-agreement costs (see Manual #4, *Development Projects*).

WWRP funds that are used for mitigation bank projects can be used only for public purposes. Private entities may not purchase mitigation bank credits from a WWRP-assisted mitigation bank.

Eligible Project Types

Applicants may seek funds to:

- Acquire land for use as a mitigation bank site (acquisition project type)
- Perform restoration on land already in the applicant's ownership or control (development/restoration project type), or
- Acquire and develop or restore land (combination project type).

Projects in the Riparian Protection Account must include an acquisition component. Development may include any of the allowable public access elements in the category.

Post-approval Obligations

All mitigation bank projects funded through WWRP must comply with adopted income generation policies. Applicants are encouraged to contact RCO staff for more information about proposed income generation policies before submitting a grant application for a mitigation bank.