

WWRP Local Parks Category Evaluation Criteria
Questions on SCORP Priorities and Cost Efficiencies
Adopted by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
February 9, 2016
Resolution #2016-04

WWRP Local Parks Evaluation Criteria Summary						
Scored by	#	Title	Project Type Questions	Maximum Points	Weight	Focus*
Advisory Committee	1	Public Need	All	15	18%	Local
Advisory Committee	2	Project Scope	All	15	18%	Local
Advisory Committee	3	SCORP Priorities	All	5	6%	State
Advisory Committee	4	Immediacy of Threat	Acquisition	10	12%	Local
			Combination	5	6%	
Advisory Committee	5	Project Design	Development	15	18%	Technical
			Combination	7.5	9%	
Advisory Committee	6	Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship	All	10	12%	State
Advisory Committee	7	Site Suitability	Acquisition	5	6%	Technical
			Combination	2.5	3%	
Advisory Committee	8	Expansion/Renovation	All	5	6%	Local
Advisory Committee	9	Project Support	All	10	12%	State/Local
Advisory Committee	10	Cost Efficiencies	All	5	6%	State/Local
RCO Staff	11	Growth Management Act Preference	All	0	0%	State
RCO Staff	12	Population Proximity	All	3	4%	State
Total Points Possible=83						

*Focus–Criteria orientation in accordance with the following priorities:

- State–Those that meet general statewide needs (often called for in Revised Codes of Washington or Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP))

- Local—Those that meet local needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans)
- Technical—Those that meet technical considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Evaluation Question #3: Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan

3. SCORP Priorities. How will this project address statewide or regional priorities as described in the Statewide Outdoor Comprehensive Recreation Plan?

- How will this project specifically provide a diversity of recreation opportunities that meet the needs of the state's underserved populations which are:
 - People with disabilities
 - People of color
 - Residents over 46 years old
 - Women
- How will this project help increase physical activities among people of all ages and abilities or low income and diverse communities?
- Will this project support federal, state, regional or local health initiatives such as:
 - National Physical Activity Plan
 - Healthy Communities Washington from the Washington Department of Health
 - Local Community Health Assessment or Local Community Health Improvement Plan
 - Health Impact Assessments from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and Pew Charitable Trust

▲ Evaluators score 0-5 points.

Adopted February 2016

Evaluation Question #10: Cost Efficiencies

10. Cost Efficiencies. To what extent does this project demonstrate efficiencies or a reduction in government costs through documented use of donations or other resources?

Donations – cash, real property, volunteer labor, equipment use, or materials

- What are the donations for this project?
- Who is making the donation?
- What is the value of the donation and how was the value determined?
- Is the donation in hand?
- If the donation is not in hand, do you have a letter of commitment from the donor that

specifies what is being donated and when?

- Is the donation necessary for implementation of the project? Are donations included in the project proposal?

Private grants awarded by non-governmental organizations

- Is there a private grant that is being used as match for this project?
- Who awarded the grant?
- What is the grant amount?
- What is the purpose of the grant?
- When will grant funds be available?

Are there other efficiencies for this project that will result in cost savings?

- What is the cost efficiency?
- Who is providing it?
- What's the value?
- When was the commitment made and when does it expire?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award 0-5 points.

Revised February 2016.