

**INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION**

**SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING**

---

*Date: September 13 & 14, 2007*

*Place: Seattle Airport Marriott  
Seattle, Washington*

---

EXECUTIVE SESSION ..... 2

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER ..... 3

CONSENT CALENDAR ..... 3

MANAGEMENT REPORTS ..... 4

2008 MEETING SCHEDULE ..... 5

NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (NRTP) GRANT FUNDING..... 5

RECOGNITION OF MARK QUINN ..... 8

WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM (WWRP) AND  
OTHER GRANT PROGRAMS' PROPOSED CHANGES ..... 9

REPORTS FROM PARTNERS ..... 12

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board  
Summary Minutes

Day 1

---

Date: September 13, 2007

Place: Seattle Airport Marriott  
Seattle, Washington

---

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Steven Drew	Olympia
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Mark Quinn	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Larry Fairleigh	Designee, 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.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chair Val Ogden called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

She then announced the Board would be going into an Executive Session for the purpose of interviewing candidates for the executive director position.

Members of the interview panel included:

Board Members

Val Ogden, Chair  
Bill Chapman, citizen member Mercer Island  
Karen Daubert, citizen member Seattle  
Steven Drew, citizen member Olympia  
Jeff Parsons, citizen member Leavenworth  
Craig Partridge, designee Department of Natural Resources  
Mark Quinn, designee Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Larry Fairleigh, designee State Parks and Recreation

Additional panel members

Jennifer Schroeder, City of Kirkland Director of Parks and Community Services  
Bill Robinson, The Nature Conservancy

The process was facilitated by Judith Brighton, Consultant.

The Executive session concluded at 4:50 p.m. Chair Ogden recessed the meeting until Friday morning, September 14.

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board  
Summary Minutes

Day 2

---

Date: September 14, 2007

PLACE: Seattle Airport Marriott  
Seattle, Washington

---

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Steven Drew	Olympia
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Mark Quinn	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Larry Fairleigh	Designee, 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 reconvened the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m. She welcomed everyone and asked board members to introduce themselves.

The agenda was reviewed and approved.

## CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of IAC minutes – June 7 & 8, 2007
2. Time Extensions

Karen Daubert asked about the time extensions and why some were extended until June and December 2008 and if there was rationale for extending until December 2008.

Chair Ogden responded that the rationale seemed reasonable to her when she read through the materials.

Steven Drew was more concerned with the Seattle Public Utilities project and why it was extended until December 2008 when they talk about completing the project within the next few months.

Marguerite Austin explained that the Seattle Public Utilities project was extended for monitoring of the project although the actual project will be completed shortly additional time is needed for monitoring efforts.

Marguerite explained that this was a project originally funded through the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) when they managed the Aquatics Land Enhancement Activities (ALEA) program. At that time, DNR had required a monitoring plan be in place, so although the funding will be off the books the monitoring portion will extend the time the project is left in an open status.

Director Johnson noted that there are a lot of projects, many on the salmon side, that although funding has been expended, the project is kept open for the monitoring portion of the project. This alleviates the reappropriation of funds issue.

Resolution #2007-15, approving the items on the consent calendar  
Craig Partridge **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2007-15. Larry Fairleigh **SECONDED**.

Resolution #2007-15 **APPROVED** as presented.

## **MANAGEMENT REPORTS**

Director Laura Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #2 for details.)

Director Johnson provided the first management report to the RCFB and the last for her as director. She noted that so far the new name has been a great success. Chair Val noted that some of the board members may be having a harder time with the name change since Recreation and Conservation Funding Board or RCFB isn't that easy to say yet.

Director Johnson informed the board about the September 26 event with the governor. This event is primarily recognition for departing Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Chair, Bill Ruckelshaus and the first years of the SRFB but will also be an opportunity for the governor to recognize the other boards and committees administered by the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). She encouraged board members to attend if possible.

The director also thanked the board for their good work in interviewing director candidates. The names will be sent to the governor soon. Deputy Director, Rachael Langen will be the acting director until the new director is on duty.

Director Johnson is going to ask Jim Fox to sit at the table in her place at the November meeting. Much of the November meeting will be focused on the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) policy changes. May of 2008 is when the next grant cycle for the WWRP starts so a lot of work is needed by the board and staff to make changes prior to the start of the next grant cycle.

Director Johnson then highlighted several items:

- Rachael Langen's work on reappropriations.
- Jim Fox's work on policies.
- Mark Jarasitis' work closing out the books on the last biennium.

- Have received approval on capital budget plan, still waiting to hear on the operating budget.
- Once we get approval on the operating budget we will be able to hire new staff.
- Office space is one of the challenges that will be facing a new director.
- The SRFB is also busy. Applications are due September 17 for the salmon grants with the funding meeting in December.
- Washington Invasive Species Council (WISC) and the Biodiversity Council are two of the other boards administered by the agency and director Johnson would encourage the RCFB to have workshops with both these groups in the future.
- The Biodiversity Council has recently released its draft strategy. She encouraged board members to review this document. The Biodiversity Council is proposing things that will affect this board.
- WISC is also really starting to move, and recently had a meeting with state counterparts and a national level representative.

Chair Ogden thanked Jim Fox and Rachael Langen for their help with the director interview process. Jennifer Schroeder and Bill Robinson also participated on the panel.

## **2008 MEETING SCHEDULE**

Tammy Owings presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #3 for details.)

Tammy outlined the proposed meeting scheduled for 2008 with meeting dates being January 15, March 27 & 28, June 19 & 20, September 25 & 26, and November 20 & 21, 2008.

Resolution #2007-16 to approve 2008 dates for regular RCFB meetings  
Mark Quinn **MOVED** to adopt the proposed 2008 meeting schedule. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**.

Board Discussion:

Karen asked if the January meeting can be dropped if all the policy decisions are made in the November meeting.

Director Johnson responded that this meeting could be taken off the schedule but wanted to get it on the calendar now in case it is needed.

Resolution #2007-16 **APPROVED** as presented.

## **NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM (NRTP) GRANT FUNDING**

Greg Lovelady presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 for details.)

Applications were received for 112 projects (84 general category, 28 education category) requesting just over \$4.72 million. Approximately \$3.2 million in NRTP funds are available for allocation. Greg provided an overview of the process, timeline, and proposed funding for 74 projects. This year the board is approving projects under two federal fiscal years (2007 and 2008). The program's goal is to rehabilitate and maintain backcountry trails.

Resolution #2007-17 adopting staff funding recommendations  
Mark Quinn **MOVED** adoption of Resolution #2007-17. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**.

Public Testimony:  
No public testimony was provided on this agenda item.

Board Discussion:  
Karen Daubert asked about the process and if this is different from past years. Greg reported that the advisory committee gets all the materials for review and scoring and then staff compiles the results. This is the usual process.

Steven Drew asked if there are remaining funds in the "motorized multi-use" and "single use" categories? Greg reported that yes there are.

Steven Drew reported that the top ranked unfunded project under the "compatible use" list is a "Friends of the Trail" project for \$30,000 (RCO #07-1305M). He urged the board to move this project to the "motorized multi-use" category because the large objects they clean up must have been delivered by motor vehicles along back country roads and tracks and thus the project grant is for clean up from motorized users. He said that it is at least as appropriate to be under the "multi-use" category and it is a unique entity. Unique in that this entity cleans up after a class of user group while others build something on behalf of a user group. He stressed that he was referring only to the motorized sub group who would access the public land to dump debris and not motorized users in general. He recommended that the available funds be used for this project.

Bill Chapman asked how the categories were defined. He agrees with Steven's assessment of what the "Friends of the Trail" does and that the Mountain to Sound Greenway has honored this group on several occasions for their trail work.

Director Johnson reviewed the decision tree for placing projects in a particular funding category. She reported that this project is unique and staff struggled with the eligibility of this project. Staff believes the project is eligible and fits the "compatible use" category best. She read the project description to board members. She explained the application was a real mix of uses and that this project isn't the highest ranked unfunded in the 40 percent for this category (The federal designation combines three categories for which 40 percent of the dollars are set aside.).

Steven doesn't see any projects unfunded above this and moving the project will not make changes to any other project on the list. From his work with this group, he has hardly ever seen work at the trailhead and finds the work is usually along the access roads and dead end tracks.

Karen Daubert agrees with Steven that this looks like a good project and it would be a good candidate to fund. She asked about the cons on funding this.

Greg reported that one disadvantage is that this would be like changing the rules in the ninth inning and that this may be a change the board would like to consider for the next grant cycle. If the rules would have been different at the beginning of this grant cycle, the board may have received different projects from applicants.

Bill Chapman asked about the ranking of this project, he heard it is the first unfunded and also not the first unfunded project.

Greg reported it is the first unfunded project in the "compatible use" category but fourteenth unfunded project overall.

Chair Ogden provided her thoughts on this project and noted she is uncomfortable in that the only reason this project was brought up was due to Steven's knowledge of the project. She does not want to see other projects brought forward at the last minute due to other member's knowledge of a project.

Karen stated that she doesn't have a problem with funding projects such as this as she knows it is a good organization and good project. She feels the board should fund this project.

Director Johnson reported that there are other projects on the list that may have similar characteristics but are unknown to board members.

Larry Fairleigh asked if it is staff's opinion that this project could fit under different categories.

Greg Lovelady reported that the project does have a little bit of both "motorized" and "non-motorized" uses and that was why staff agreed with the applicant's "compatible use" proposal.

Craig Partridge asked if the \$66,000 noted in footnote #3 are funds from previous grant cycles. And if so, it seems to be an ongoing issue with having additional funds in this program, should the board be asking staff to provide a policy answer to this question and ways to get the funds spent. He is okay with moving this project to the "motorized" category and to fund it this grant cycle.

Steven Drew made motion to **AMEND** the resolution by making one change to move project #07-1305M to the “motorized” category and funding it. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**.

Board Discussion:

Bill Chapman asked if stakeholders in the “motorized” category would be offended with funding this project. Greg responded that staff has not had time to check with stakeholders but believes that “yes” it would offend some but not all of the stakeholders.

Bill is not usually in favor of making changes like this but in this case would support the change.

Resolution #2007-17 **APPROVED** as amended.

The chair would like staff to look at federal guidelines on how to handle this change.

## **RECOGNITION OF MARK QUINN**

Chair Val Ogden announced that Mark Quinn is going to be retiring in October. Chair Ogden read into the record Resolution #2007-18 recognizing Mark’s work on the board.

Resolution #2007-18 - Recognition Resolution for Mark Quinn

The Board unanimously approved the resolution recognizing Mark Quinn for his time on the Board representing the Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Board Discussion:

Craig Partridge spoke on behalf of the Department of Natural Resources and talked about land transactions between the two agencies and how seamless this has been during Mark’s tenure. He has appreciated having worked with Mark over the years.

The board then presented Mark with a plaque and cake.

Mark noted that this caught him by surprise. He then provided a going away speech. He believes his greatest accomplishment has been the acquisition of public land and, as Mark Twain said, “buy land they aren’t making anymore.”

Jim Fox prepared to present the next agenda item, however, before going to the next item, he asked for board direction regarding the NRTP discussion. Although many of the board members discussed the need for change in policy he didn’t hear any direction on what they were wanting.

Chair Ogden believes it is the one category that is undersubscribed and would like to see if there are changes that would encourage full funding under this category.

Craig Partridge would like staff to come back with a few options for project funding either on a case-by-case basis or program-wide.

## **WASHINGTON WILDLIFE AND RECREATION PROGRAM (WWRP) AND OTHER GRANT PROGRAMS' PROPOSED CHANGES**

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #5 for details.)

Bill Chapman reported that he has no criticism on how the NRTP funding was handled and staff did everything appropriately but it is the role of the board to do what is best when it comes to funding projects.

Steven Drew agrees with both Bill and Craig's comments. The process was applied fairly and with good intent but the first effort did not expend all the funds. He believes, if there are unspent funds, there should be a procedure in place for the board to make adjustments to better expend the funds.

Jim Fox will look at policy changes for just the NRTP category at this time.

Chair Ogden reported that there was a request for public testimony under this agenda item by Mike Ryherd who needs to leave shortly. She asked Mike to provide his testimony before additional presentation by staff.

Public Testimony:

Mike Ryherd, Washington Wildlife Recreation Coalition (WWRC), read the comments on the proposed WWRP policy changes.

WWRC Response to Local Parks Category: "The maximums have not been adjusted for inflation since the beginning of the program. WWRC staff suggests that the lids be increased to \$750,000 for acquisition projects, \$500,000 for development projects and \$1 Million for combination projects (with a maximum of \$500,000 being used for development within a combination project.)"

WWRC Response to Preference for Match: "We believe that state projects that bring match dollars to the table should be given extra points during the evaluation process."

WWRC Response to Mitigation Banking Projects: "We believe it is too early to have enough data about mitigation banking projects in order to review their success or failure. Other than recommending that mitigation banking projects be removed as allowable in the Urban Wildlife Habitat category, we would recommend that the current process be continued through the 2009/2011 application process, and then have a special review committee established to review both the process and the outcomes."

Bill Chapman asked why the suggestion to remove mitigation banking from the Urban Wildlife Habitat category?

Mike responded that there are several reasons in that the criteria in Urban Wildlife Habitat is different from criteria for Critical Habitat and the Riparian Protection Account.

The mitigation banking concept fits better in the other two categories, if at all, but does not necessarily fit Urban Habitat which are more discreet projects and are located near urban centers where you would not necessarily put mitigation banks.

WWRC Response to Phased Projects: “The WWRC has consistently held the position that projects should compete in each category in each funding cycle so that the Governor, the legislature, the applicants and the taxpayers will always know they are funding the best. We are opposed to giving automatic standing to a project, or a portion of a project, simply because some aspect of the project was funded or had scored well in a previous round of evaluation. In other grant programs where projects became “entitled” to subsequent funding on the basis of previous funding or project scores, the grant program has been damaged by “gaming” of the system and a feeling of favoritism for certain projects or sponsors.”

WWRC Response to Population Points: “The process should be reevaluated to be sure that the right incentives are in the program to promote concurrency and more intense density development under the growth management goals and regulations. However, at the same time, the WWRP has been the only allowable grant dollars available for many small rural communities which, without WWRP matching funds, would have no recreational areas available in their communities at all. Care should be taken to make sure we do not unbalance the teeter-totter at the expense of the program and threaten to not have it serve the entire state.”

WWRC Response to Riparian Protection Account: “Traditionally the only category to have a project “cap” has been Local Parks and the system has seemed to serve us well. In the first funding cycle, caps were placed on the Riparian and the Farmland Preservation sections. We believe that the caps in both categories should be removed for future grant cycles.”

WWRC Response to Urban Wildlife Habitat (UWH) Category: “This issue has had a stormy past with the legislators wading in to provide what they have believed was at least an appearance of equity between large agencies and small agencies in the process. The issue stems around competition between state agencies, which in recent times have dominated the category, at the expense of local governments, with projects that are questionable as to their “urbanness”. In the past two legislative appropriations, language was added to split the funding to “no less than 40% going to local government projects and 60% to state projects.” A special sub-committee of the RCO has recommended that the criteria be changed to a “40% set aside for the highest ranked local projects, a 40% set aside for the highest ranking state projects and that the remaining 20% go to the next highest ranking projects regardless of sponsor.” Your staff concurs with these recommendations and feels that this would be a fair way to reconcile this problem.”

WWRC Response to Project Ranking in the State Parks Category: “There is little in the statute law setting up the WWRP that sets criteria for state parks projects. However, the State Parks Commission has numerous legislative mandates to fulfill in

recommending funding of projects. Your staff feels that there is little reason to have a duplicate ranking process for the State Parks category when only State Parks Projects can compete for the funding. In any other category that a State Parks project competes, such in in the Trails or Water Access categories, they should be reviewed and ranked on the same criteria as all other competing projects, regardless of sponsor.”

WWRC Response to Project Ranking by State Agencies Competing in Habitat Conservation Account Categories: “Unlike the State Parks Category of the WWRP, all agencies competing in the other categories are competing against each other, as well as local governments and tribal projects. Further, projects competing in these categories are subject to criteria included in the WWRP implementing statutes that many times are not used by the agencies to internally rank their own projects. On those rare occasions when the internal ranking of an agency’s projects are overturned by the ranking provided through the WWRP review process, the state agency should be able to ask for a review to determine if their was a misunderstanding of the importance of the project to the agency, of if the difference was due to the fact that the project did not score as highly under the legislatively mandated criteria used in the WWRP ranking process.”

Bill Chapman asked about the difference in state parks list and if the changes in statute were made.

Marguerite Austin responded that changes were made to the requirements for acquisition amounts. It changed from 75 percent to no less than 50 percent for acquisition. Mike responded that the state parks prioritized list would need to fit the statutory requirements, as well as agency policies, to have their list approved by the board.

WWRC Response to Farmland Preservation Program: “Yes the cap should be removed (see above discussion about removing caps for the Riparian Category.) The weighting of leases versus permanent easements should be left to the discretion of the evaluators rather than applying a “one size fits all” response that allows little flexibility.”

WWRC Response to Noxious Weed Eradication: “WWRC Staff does not believe this amount should be increased because it is a questionable use of Bond acquisition dollars for M&O responsibilities, most state agencies already pay a weed board assessment on an annual basis and under the recent changes to the WWRC statute, both WDNR and WDFW now pay in-lieu tax assessments on their habitat lands to the local governments for this, and other, purposes.”

Jim Fox asked what Mike meant, under the States Park category, about giving deference. Mike responded that if they followed the guidelines, then their list would not go through a second ranking process.

Steven asked about the phased project recommendation and if there is a project of concern? Is there a way to keep from presenting phases but submit in one large project but to fund in phases?

Mike believes there is a way to look at the initial project with its different phases and then give points over the whole project.

Steven talked about having criteria to add bonus points.

Chair Ogden asked the board to not ask questions of Jim Fox at this meeting but to listen to the overview today.

Jim reported staff is in the middle of a three step process – first was identifying the issues. Staff are now in the middle of getting public comment on the issues and then developing recommendations from the comments received, and then sending out for a second round of public comment with decisions being made in November and, if necessary, at the January 2008 meeting.

Bill Chapman wanted to make sure of the communication protocol and whether to call Jim directly. Director Johnson reported that it would be best to go directly to Jim with comments.

Director Johnson made a comment on the population points and how the board does want to make sure that changes aren't made that would limit small towns from being competitive in this process.

Larry Fairleigh noted that staff appropriately solicits comments from a large number of people but wanted to make sure the board knew that the comments by the State Park's staff was not a Parks Commission comment and that he will provide the RCFB with the official Parks Commission comments.

## **REPORTS FROM PARTNERS**

No reports at this meeting.

Director Johnson reminded the board of the two events scheduled for September 26<sup>th</sup>: At 3:30 p.m. is a recognition event for the SRFB and other boards administered by the RCO. This event will be held in the State Reception Room. At 5:30 p.m. until early evening there will be a private event held at Indian Summer to honor Director Johnson's time with the state. She encouraged board members to attend both events if possible.

Chair Ogden did not want to say good bye to Director Johnson at this meeting but will wait to say good-bye at the event on the 26<sup>th</sup>. She thanked Director Johnson for her good work on the board.

The first meeting of the RCFB adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Approved by:

Val Ogden  
Val Ogden, Chair

11/1/07  
Date

Next meeting:        November 1 & 2, 2007  
                              NRB 172, Olympia

**RESOLUTION #2007-15**  
**September 2007 Consent Agenda**

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the following September 2007, Consent Agenda items are approved:

- a) Approval of the last meeting of the IAC Minutes – June 7 & 8, 2007
- b) Time Extensions,

Moved by:     Craig Partridge    

Seconded by:     Larry Fairleigh    

Adopted / Defeated / Deferred (underline result)

Date: September 14, 2007

**Attachment A  
Time Extension Requests for Board Approval  
Resolution #2007-15**

<b>PROJECT #</b>	<b>SPONSOR NAME</b>	<b>PROJECT NAME</b>	<b>GRANT PROGRAM</b>	<b>DATE BOARD FUNDED</b>	<b>EXTENSION REQUESTED</b>	<b>Circumstance or reasons for delay</b>
02-1404	Department of Natural Resources	Tahuya ORV Trails Plan	NOVA	03/13/2003	11/30/2007	DNR has experienced a staff change that has resulted in the need for additional time to complete the Tahuya Trail Plan, which is approximately 85% complete. The SEPA comment period will be from September 14 through September 28. The requested extension will ensure adequate time for DNR Executive Management review of the public comments before the plan is finalized. There have been no increases in costs because of delays in completing the project.
03-1185C	Seattle Public Utilities	Salmon Bay	ALEA	07/01/2003	12/31/2008	This project involves acquisition and restoration on Salmon Bay. The acquisition from multiple property owners is complete and restoration is underway. The restoration project involves a number of partners and a scope of work that is much broader than the ALEA portion of the project. The project was put out to bid and the bids were too high. Following redesign and re-scoping, the project is back on track and Seattle hopes to complete all work within the next few months. They have requested a longer-extension to allow for monitoring following project completion.
00-1525D	State Parks	Mystery Bay	BFP – State	07/01/2001	12/31/2007	Construction of a two-lane boat ramp, boarding floats, parking and restrooms are all included in this project. Following a complex planning and permitting process, State Parks requested and received approval of a permit that allowed in-water work windows in 2006. In March 2007, an extension of the Army Corps of Engineers permit was granted to allow for another work window. Although they have experienced several challenges related to wetland impacts, buffer issues, redesign and increased costs, they hope to complete the remaining work this year.

2<sup>nd</sup> Request

PROJECT #	SPONSOR NAME	PROJECT NAME	GRANT PROGRAM	DATE BOARD FUNDED	EXTENSION REQUESTED	Circumstance or reasons for delay
02-1196D	Vancouver Parks and Recreation	Haagen Park	WWRP – Local Parks	07/11/2003	03/31/2008	The City of Vancouver split this project into two phases. Phase one, development of the athletic fields and perimeter trail, represents the highest priority elements and is complete. Phase two, which includes the restroom and picnic area, required extensive work with design consultants and permitting agencies. Construction will begin in the fall 2007 and be completed during the winter of 2008
02-1101A	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Dungeness River	WWRP – Critical Habitat	07/11/2003	12/31/2007	The goal of this project is to acquire riparian area along the Dungeness River where the river crosses Highway 101. WDFW has acquired two of four target properties for this project located in Clallam County. The other two target properties had unwilling sellers. WDFW has identified an alternative property of approximately 30 acres, which is adjacent to existing WDFW property on the lower Dungeness River, and has started negotiations with the landowner. An appraisal has been ordered. WDFW has a federal grant, which requires a state grant match. WDFW must secure an option by October 31, 2007. The extension will provide opportunity to complete the appraisal and reviews and purchase of the property.
02-1199A	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	South Puget Sound Prairies and Oak Woodland	WWRP – Critical Habitat	07/11/2003	06/30/2008	The goal of this project is to protect remaining prairies and oak woodland primarily in Thurston County. To date WDFW has only expended 4% of the funds since negotiations, with target property owners, have not been successful. WDFW is requesting additional time to continue negotiations and potentially pursue alternative properties. An option agreement must be secured by December 31, 2007. This project is one part of a multi-agency effort to protect habitat in South Puget Sound.
03-1182A	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Telegraph Slough	ALEA	07/01/2003	06/30/2008	The goal of this project is to purchase estuarine habitat around Padilla Bay in Skagit County. This project was originally sponsored by Skagit County but was transferred to WDFW in 2005. Since then, WDFW has acquired two of the target properties, obtained WDFW Commission approval for a purchase of a third property, and has secured an option on a fourth property. Any additional property must be secured by an option agreement by December 31, 2007. WDFW has a federal grant for this project, which requires a state grant match.

**RESOLUTION #2007-16**

**ADOPTION OF THE 2007 RCFB MEETING SCHEDULE**

**BE IT RESOLVED**, the following schedule for 2008 regular meetings of the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board is hereby adopted; and,

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, staff is directed to publish notice in the State Register accordingly.

January 15, 2008	Tuesday	Olympia
March 27 & 28, 2008	Thursday and Friday	Olympia
June 19 & 20, 2008	Thursday and Friday	Travel Meeting
September 25 & 26, 2008	Thursday and Friday	Travel Meeting
November 20 & 21, 2008	Thursday and Friday	Olympia

*Resolution Moved By:* Mark Quinn

*Resolution Seconded By:* Karen Daubert

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: September 14, 2007

## RESOLUTION #2007-17

### Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2007 and 2008 NRTP Project Funding

September 14, 2007

**WHEREAS**, through the early months of 2007, until the May application deadline, the Recreation and Conservation Office's (RCO) staff provided publications, website updates, public workshops, and other outreach opportunities to communicate to interested parties the benefits and application procedures for the National Recreational Trails Program (NRTP); and

**WHEREAS**, in answer to these efforts, 112 applications eligible for funding were received; and

**WHEREAS**, each of these projects were evaluated and scored by the RCO's advisory committee using Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) approved criteria; and

**WHEREAS**, the result of this evaluation is a set of recommendations that meets both federal and state program criteria; and

**WHEREAS**, \$1,639,801 for FFY 2007 and \$1,573,728 (estimated) for FFY 2008 is available for distribution to these projects; and

**WHEREAS**, RCO staff has added a federal fiscal year designation to each project as required by NRTP's federal program administrator, the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA);

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the RCFB amends the original Table 1 provided in the September 14, 2007 board notebook material by re-categorizing project 07-1305m, Trailhead/Access Point Clean Ups, from the "compatible use" category to the "motorized multiple use" category; and

**BE IT FURTHER IT RESOLVED**, that the RCFB approves funding for the projects ranked in this revised "Table 1, NRTP Projects Funding Recommendations, September 2007" (Attachment 2); and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Director is authorized to seek approval from FHWA, to fund alternate projects with any unallocated monies that may become available; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Director is instructed to seek authorization to proceed with execution of applicable agreements, and other appropriate steps, from the FHWA for implementation of these projects.

Resolution to amend the resolution by: Steven Drew

Resolution to amend seconded by: Karen Daubert

**Adopted** September 14, 2007

**RESOLUTION #2007-18**  
**SERVICE RECOGNITION – Mark Quinn**

**WHEREAS**, from 2004 through September 2007, Mark Quinn served the citizens of Washington and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife as the agency's designee on the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) and subsequently the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB); and

**WHEREAS**, Mr. Quinn's service with the IAC and RCFB assisted the citizens of Washington in programs for conservation, stewardship, acquisition, and development of recreation and habitat resources; and

**WHEREAS**, Mr. Quinn will be retiring from state service in October; and

**WHEREAS**, members of the RCFB wish to recognize Mr. Quinn's support and service, as well as the pleasure of his company; and

**WHEREAS**, the RCFB wishes him well in future endeavors, with particular wishes for his future outdoor recreation and conservation pursuits,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that, on behalf of the citizens of Washington and in recognition of Mr. Quinn's assistance to the IAC/RCFB in performing his responsibilities and duties as a member, the Board and its staff extends its thanks and appreciation to him, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Director of the Department of Fish and Wildlife, along with a letter of appreciation to Mr. Quinn.

Unanimously approved by the

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD

Meeting at SeaTac, Washington on September 14, 2007.

---

Attest: Val Ogden, Chair