

**WWRP Water Access Category Evaluation Criteria  
 Questions on SCORP Priorities and Cost Efficiencies  
 Adopted by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board  
 February 9, 2016  
 Resolution #2016-05**

<b>WWRP Water Access Evaluation Criteria Summary</b>						
<b>Score</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Project Type</b>	<b>Maximum Points Possible</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Focus</b>
Advisory Committee	1	Public Need	All	15	19%	Local
Advisory Committee	2	SCORP Priorities	All	5	6%	State
Advisory Committee	3	Immediacy of Threat	Acquisition	15	19%	Local
			Combination	7.5	10%	
Advisory Committee	4	Project Design	Development	10	13%	Technical
			Combination	5	6%	
Evaluation Team	5	Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship	All	10	13%	State
Advisory Committee	6	Site Suitability	All	10	13%	Technical
Advisory Committee	7	Expansion	All	5	6%	State
Advisory Committee	8	Diversity of Recreational Uses	Development	5	6%	State
			Combination	2.5	3%	
Advisory Committee	9	Project Support	All	10	13%	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
<b>Total Points Possible:=78</b>						

\*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 the State 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 #2: Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan

**2. 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.