

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up
5. Revised Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Farmland Preservation Evaluation Criteria and Policies	Briefing	Staff will work to revise the recommendations based on the board's direction, open a public comment period, and bring final recommendations for board decision to the November meeting.
6. Overview of Potential Changes to the Grant Programs and Criteria for 2015-17	Briefing	No follow up action requested
7. Overview of Changes to the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program	Briefing	After the public comment period, staff will bring options for board decision to a future meeting.
8. Administrative and Policy Impacts from New Federal Omni-Circular Rules	Briefing	Staff will work to incorporate the board's direction and report back at a future meeting.
9. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Review – Opportunity for the Board to Provide Input	Discussion	Staff will continue to keep the board apprised of the progress of the review process.
10. Board Discussion on Scope of Recreation and Conservation Policy Planning	Discussion	Staff will prepare a draft scope of work and detailed budget based on the direction of the board and present it at the November meeting

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: September 16, 2015

Place: Spokane, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Harriet Spanel	Chair, Bellingham	Peter Herzog	Designee, State Parks & Recreation Commission
Betsy Bloomfield	Yakima	Joe Stohr	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pete Mayer	Renton		
Ted Willhite	Twisp		

It is intended that this summary be used with the materials provided in advance of the meeting. The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) retains a recording as the formal record of the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) meeting.

Call to Order

Chair Spanel called the meeting to order at 8:31 a.m. Staff called roll and determined a quorum. Member Herman and Member Deller were excused.

Chair Spanel asked the board to review and approve the agenda. Member Stohr moved to approve the agenda; Member Willhite seconded. The motion carried.

Item 1: Approval of Meeting Minutes

Chair Spanel called for a motion to approve the June 24-25, 2015 meeting minutes. Member Willhite moved to approve the minutes; Member Stohr seconded. Member Mayer shared several edits to the minutes, which the board reviewed and accepted. The board approved the June 24-25, 2015 board meeting minutes.

Resolution 2015-18

Moved by: Member Willhite

Seconded by: Member Stohr

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 2: Director's Report

The board discussed the meeting calendar for 2016, specifically the adjustment of the budget and travel meetings during the summer. The board settled on July 13-14, 2016 for combined travel/budget meeting.

Director Kaleen Cottingham provided a brief summary of the items highlighted in the board materials, including an update on the latest Salmon Recovery Funding Board meeting, the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) stakeholder review process, and her recent attendance at a meeting of the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers (NASORLO) in South Carolina.

Director Cottingham brought the board's attention to the correspondence between herself and Senator Jim Honeyford regarding RCO Project 14-1097A, included in the board materials. Chair Spanel shared her support of the response's approach. If further correspondence is needed, Director Cottingham will communicate with the board.

Director Cottingham shared several recent RCO staff changes. Karl Jacobs was promoted to the Senior Outdoor Grants Manager (OGM) in the Recreation and Conservation Section. Adam Cole, was selected as a new policy specialist in September. Sarah Thirtyacre, Senior OGM and Cultural Resources Specialist will shift from being a part of the Recreation and Conservation Section and will report directly to the Deputy Director on cultural resources and other special agency projects like the No Child Left Inside Grant program. Karen Edwards has joined RCO from the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission. There is still one more OGM position to fill. In the fiscal section, Brent Hedden, RCO's chief accountant, accepted a promotion at the Department of Social and Health Services, and the agency is recruiting to fill that position. Kiko Freeman, one of RCO's fiscal analysts, moved to Louisiana and was replaced by Sabrina Subia, who started in July. We have also hired a new OGM in the Salmon Section, Josh Lambert.

Director Cottingham shared that she meets quarterly with many stakeholder groups (boaters, land trusts, etc.). RCO recently created a new stakeholder group focused on trails. At the first meeting, twelve trail organizations discussed meeting with the director and RCO staff on motorized and non-motorized trail issues. They decided to meet twice a year.

Biennial Work plan Overview: Scott Robinson, Deputy Director, provided an overview of the agency's biennial work plan, highlighting the implementation of the federal Omni-Circular, new grant programs,

legislative assignments, policy development, board priorities, and IT enhancements. IT enhancements include moving RCO servers to the cloud, improving PRISM performance, the second phase of e-billing, a new mapping solution for staff, and developing an electronic technical review and evaluation module and scoring solution.

Member Willhite asked about the intended "Cloud" hosting that RCO is considering. Both Director Cottingham and Deputy Robinson confirmed that it will be hosted by Amazon, and perhaps hosted by a more secure authority at a later time.

Member Willhite asked if field staff will be able to sync in real time with internal agency programs. Deputy Robinson stated staff primarily do most of their work in the office, such as review applications, rather than in the field. However PRISM is available to staff from anywhere they have access to Wi-Fi.

Grant Management Report: Marguerite Austin, RCO Section Manager, reminded the board that at the June meeting the grant programs' ranked lists were approved and authority delegated to the director to award funding to the approved projects, contingent on approval of a 2015-17 Capital Budget and approval of federal funding authority for federal programs. Director Cottingham has since awarded 219 grants in 8 grant programs and 61 grants in the new RCO Recreation Grants Program.

Ms. Austin highlighted the work of RCO's Natural Resource Policy Specialist, Leslie Connelly, in modifying RCO project agreements. In collaboration with RCO's assistant attorney general, Ms. Connelly updated three project agreements to ensure incorporation of the new requirements related to the new federal Omni-Circular. One agreement is for board programs, the second for funding U.S. Forest Service projects, and the third is for line-item appropriations and RCO projects that do not go through the board.

Member Mayer asked Ms. Austin to describe the differences that may occur due to the Legislative appropriations outside the program. Ms. Austin explained that not many changes will occur at the grant applicant level. The primary difference is that certain kinds of project changes the director will have authority to approve, however, plans are to use existing policies for the projects awarded RCO Recreation Grants.

Member Mayer commented on the specific rules of the Outdoor Recreation Account (ORA), asking about the influence on conversions and funding in excess of project costs, where no rules are in place. Director Cottingham explained that there is no authority to spend returned funds or funds not appropriated to specific projects in the new RCO Recreation Grants category, but the agency may seek authority in the future. We will address that issue as we develop our budget requests for the 2017-2019 biennium. Ms. Austin explained that some projects were fully funded or use match funds, and seeking authority to spend the funds will support those projects; also, in contracts sponsors agree to follow the same rules, as the ORA does not speak directly to conversions.

Member Willhite asked about the unobligated \$4 million in funds and how the agency intends to approach the Legislature, and suggested building support to seek spending authority. Director Cottingham replied that the decision has not been made at this time and it's perhaps best to wait until next year as we develop our budget requests for the 2017-2019 biennium.

Member Mayer asked if the director will seek board direction; Director Cottingham confirmed this is part of the usual summer budget meeting of the board.

Legislative and Budget Update: Wendy Brown provided an overview of the recent legislative session, as well as a summary of the operating and capital budgets as they affect RCO. A new grant program that the agency will manage in conjunction with State Parks – *No Child Left Inside* – was funded at \$1 million. In

addition, funding was set aside to support a new recreation advisor position in the Governor's Office. Other new programs include the Washington Coastal Restoration Initiative, the Chehalis Catastrophic Flood Relief Program, and the Recreation Grant Program.

The Legislature included a proviso for a review of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) via a stakeholder process. The purpose is to examine potential statutory revisions. Another proviso was for the Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) program to require grant recipients to provide accommodations for low-income families, such as fee waivers and scholarships.

In addition to the RCO WWRP proviso, the Joint Legislative and Audit Review Committee (JLARC) was directed to conduct a review of recreation and conservation programs in place since 1990, with the goal of examining land acquisitions across the state in all programs as well as regulations for land protection in various programs (e.g., hydrologic practice permits, forest practices, forest management, etc.). RCO anticipates providing information to support this effort.

Ms. Brown reported that during the 2016 supplemental budget session, or short session, RCO intends to submit three decision packages: reauthorization of the Washington Invasive Species Council (WISC), reauthorization of the Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group (Lands Group), and potential statutory changes to the WWRP that may result from the facilitated stakeholder review process currently underway (see Item 3 of the board materials for decision package details).

During the 2015 legislative session, the Legislature passed a transportation revenue package that increased the gas tax by 7 cents per gallon. As a result, more money will be deposited into the accounts that fund the Boating Facilities Program (BFP) and the Nonhighway and Off-road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) program. RCO will submit a capital budget request seeking spending authority to use the increased funds, anticipating about \$3.5M more for BFP and \$1.3M more for NOVA. RCO plans to use this additional money to continue to fund projects on the lists approved by the board in June 2015.

Member Mayer requested information about the operations of the Lands Group, stating that according to statute they must seek input from this board prior to sunset. Ms. Brown shared that the intent is to bring the request to the Legislature and include a presentation at the next board meeting in November.

Member Willhite asked if a plan exists to coordinate any support or management with other agencies in response to this summer's wildfires. Director Cottingham explained that the board has minimal discretion to move allocated funds, but staff participate in support committees. Member Willhite encouraged these issues be part of the board's approach to grant policy and management. Ms. Austin explained that some time extensions were granted due to fires; staff will propose to move grant cycle later in the year in 2016 as staff are out working on fires in summer months and cause consistently tight timelines. Member Bloomfield suggested potential inclusion at the policy level, specifically referencing the WWRP Trails Category and consideration of trails as fire suppression mechanisms. She added that merging recreational areas with fire management practices may enhance support in statewide efforts.

Chair Spanel asked for motion to support agency submission of the supplemental budget. Member Willhite made a motion; Member Stohr seconded. Motion carried.

Item 3: State Agency Partner Reports

Washington State Parks: Member Herzog provided an update regarding the budget for State Parks. Revenues for 2013-15 biennium increased greatly. The reason for the increase is still unclear, but is important as it may support the future budget requests. He described the budget outcomes, including opportunities to increase staff, support programs and facility management. Member Herzog outlined the

increasing Discover Pass revenues and related projections. In terms of policy, State Parks is looking to restore or convert the Saint Edwards Seminary in Kenmore and is considering a potential land exchange on Lake Washington; both projects would involve a Land and Water Conversion Fund conversion, and thus may come before the board at a later time.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW): Member Stohr provided an update on behalf of WDFW. Despite controversial issues (land acquisition, wolves, fish hatcheries, enforcement roles), the agency's operation and capital budgets increased, including a substantial general fund addition. The agency received funding for several policy requests. With a new director in place and the legislative session complete, the agency is seeking input on policy changes that deal with public relevancy and transparency in preparation for the next session. Workshops are scheduled across the state to provide opportunity for public comment as part of [Washington's Wild Future](#).

Member Willhite asked Member Stohr to provide information about the Lands 20/20 Program progress in future partner reports. He then asked Member Herzog about the economic impact to State Parks' information being put on online for public access. Member Herzog stated that there has been an impact, but the agency has a public relations rollout plan. Member Stohr added that he would make copies of comments sent to the coalition for distribution.

Member Willhite asked whether the McDonald property on Lake Washington was targeted for traditional park development or open space development. Member Herzog replied that the property has an informal trail for public use, but no additional plans other than opportunities for formalized shoreline activity (swimming, etc.). Director Cottingham added the McDonald property is the only undeveloped stretch of land on Lake Washington.

General Public Comment: No public comment was received.

Board Business: Decisions

Item 4: LWCF: Legacy Program Nationwide Competition

Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Conservation Section Manager stated that in 2014 the National Park Service (NPS) announced plans for a new national competitive grant program. The Legacy Program is intended to fund the acquisition and development of public outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Ms. Austin described the program policies, eligibility criteria, priorities and funding. She reminded the board that because of the tight timeline, last year the board delegated authority to the director to select and submit projects for the national competition. Following review by the advisory committee, the director selected the top two projects for submittal to NPS. Unfortunately, the projects submitted did not receive funding.

NPS will be accepting grant applications for another national competition in 2015. RCO staff wants to ensure applicants from the State of Washington have an opportunity to participate in this competition. Because the timeline is unknown, staff is asking the board to delegate authority to the director to select and submit projects for the national completion. Staff will ensure the board is aware of the projects and any decisions made should the NPS notice not arrive in time for the next regular meeting. The board discussed an amendment to the resolution, which includes informing the board of any decisions made.

Member Stohr asked about potential outcomes due to project competitions. Ms. Austin explained that new discussions with potential sponsors have not been held; however, last year there was strong interest from Seattle and Tacoma. Staff intend to work with local governments to submit proposals. Member Stohr addressed the need for public comment; Ms. Austin explained that at the November meeting an update

would be provided and at that time the public would be invited to comment. All is dependent upon the timing of NPS's notice of the federal funding opportunity.

Resolution 2015-19 – As Amended

Moved by: Member Mayer

Seconded by: Member Bloomfield

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 5: Review of Revised Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Farmland Preservation Evaluation Criteria

Leslie Connelly, Natural Resource Policy Specialist, provided an update on the feedback from the Farmland Preservation Advisory Committee and from the Department of Revenue. Additionally, since writing the board memo for this meeting, new staff recommendations have been drafted for board consideration. She requested board direction on how to address the recent feedback and recommendations.

Ms. Connelly described the policies and criteria for each item, providing background, a summary of the feedback received, the staff recommendation provided for board direction, and the pros and cons of each item.

Member Mayer asked for the definition of "prime farmland." Ms. Connelly explained the US Department of Agriculture defines prime farmland based on soil types. Prime farmland was part of the criteria presented in June but it is not in the criteria now.

Member Mayer asked about the term "property owner" versus "land owner" and why family is included in the expanded definition. Ms. Connelly explained that property owner and land owner mean the same thing; however, RCO could more clearly define the reference to "family member" in the definition of land owner. Ms. Connelly agreed that "property owner" could be the term to use, and that the family definition is largely driven by farm operations in practice. Family inclusion allows for parcels to be non-contiguous that are operated as a single unit. Director Cottingham explained that this policy would support multiple parcels under different ownership to be included in one grant application if they are contiguous. Member Mayer expressed concerns about missing the program intent by not being inclusive in the definitions.

Member Stohr asked about the complications in scoring that led to the recommendation for applications with more than one parcel. Ms. Connelly shared a project example, noting that the large grant projects had elements that were difficult to separate for scoring and appropriate funding.

Regarding the policy on impervious surface limits, Director Cottingham noted that the downside of aligning with the NRCS standards is that they change frequently, and would require the board to address new policies just as frequently if authority is not granted to the director to apply the NRCS standards on projects that have NRCS as match.

Member Bloomfield expressed a pre-disposition to allowing public access to lands funded by state dollars and programs. The term "trail" may be a non-inclusive term that is not accounting for diverse means of public access. She recommended a reframe of the policy away from the term "trail" to "public access." She believes it is critical that this be put out for public comment, and go to other organizations besides the Washington Association of Land Trusts (WALT). She stated that impervious surface should be reframed as well, as it clouds the definitions of public access and trails.

Member Herzog asked about existing trails: if a conservation easement is considered, is this a disadvantage? Ms. Connelly explained that a pre-existing trail would remain despite an additional farmland easement (since the trail existed first).

Member Willhite agreed with Member Bloomfield about highlighting public access when public funds are used, as well as each being put out for public comment with the feedback from the advisory committee.

Chair Spanel asked about public access and whether it should be defined. The board discussed the issues involved with requiring, incentivizing, or promoting public access in this grant program. Considerations to keep in mind include the landowner perspective, implications for trail connectivity, and public engagement in policy development.

Chair Spanel asked about the revision of the first question in the evaluation criteria. Ms. Connelly confirmed that many elements are removed from the version the board saw in June and the focus is on equal ground for consideration and scoring of farmland versus rangeland. Member Bloomfield agreed that this correction is important, but recommended some additional tweaks to the wording so that it accounts for a variety of crops (e.g., dry land for wheat) and range needs. Member Mayer also agreed with the Chair; however, he disagreed with the decrease of the community values aspect as it does not account for multiple needs and interests. Ms. Connelly explained how the point adjustments would be made to account for different elements.

Member Stohr agreed with Member Bloomfield regarding crop needs and adjusting the language to account for this issue, noting that water availability rights could be difficult to analyze. Chair Spanel read a comment received via email from Member Herman, who is in favor of not awarding point values for public access.

The board discussed the options for adjusting the scoring of community values and stewardship, including benefits and consequences. Ms. Connelly proposed a new timeline to accomplish the work described. Next steps include a public comment period and revising the policies based on comments received. The final revisions will be brought to the November 18-19 meeting for board decision.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Break: 10:52 a.m. – 11:05 a.m.

Board Business: Briefings & Discussions

Item 6: Overview of Potential Changes to the Grant Programs and Criteria for 2015-17

Leslie Connelly, Natural Resource Policy Specialist, summarized the policies and criteria brought before the board for direction. For each policy or criteria item, Ms. Connelly provided background, a summary of the feedback received, the staff recommendation provided for board direction, and the pros and cons of each item.

Control and Tenure Policy

The board discussed state and sponsor perspectives and potential impacts. Member Bloomfield recommended an amount threshold as a consideration and to allow for flexibility in the timeline for complex projects. Director Cottingham added that control and tenure has been an issue for a long time and there is desire to move away from the normal 25-year lease.

Chair Spanel read a comment from Member Herman that suggested developing a board policy for shorter (control and tenure) timeframes. Member Willhite stated that a standard policy would likely be insufficient, and building in flexibility is important, especially in land acquisitions for public purposes. Director Cottingham agreed, but explained that the policy is more relevant to development projects.

Member Mayer clarified that inequity is a larger issue, and it is important to ensure that the investments made today are not undone in the future. He recommended that those projects requiring a longer exception come before the board for consideration.

Trailerable Boats

The board discussed the potential options presented by staff. Member Herzog asked for clarification regarding the facility use for trailerable boats. Ms. Connelly explained that facilities exclusively designed for use by only large boats would not receive these points in the evaluation process.

Member Mayer was concerned about equity for large versus small vessels, specifically where investments are made to ensure keeping both boat types. Ms. Connelly described the BIG program's ways to balance investment and use. Chair Spanel recommended option 2.

Multi-Site Acquisition Strategy for WWRP Habitat Categories

Member Stohr suggested an approach where there is coordination with local authorities versus estimation of needs. Member Willhite agreed with an approach that includes more consultation with the local agencies. The board discussed maintaining the multi-site acquisition strategy policy and adding a policy on local jurisdiction to the scope change policy to allow for more coordination. The majority of the board agreed that the policy change on scope changes should be brought for public comment.

Multi-Site Development for Trails and Water Trails

In response to board questions, Ms. Connelly explained that this issue mainly impacts the ALEA Program and WWRP, while NOVA and RTP are not as significantly impacted. LWCF is more complex, and the recommendation does not include this program. Member Bloomfield and Member Willhite agreed with the staff recommendation. Member Mayer expressed concerns about the potential for additional problems to arise from the second option. After discussing the options further, the majority favored option two. Ms. Connelly shared that with this direction she would open the recommendations for public comments and gather feedback.

Invasive Species Prevention

Member Mayer questioned the rationale behind implementing policy regarding invasive species, considering that the main focus is sustainability. Member Bloomfield suggested that the policy is less a requirement, and more of an opportunity to count as an eligible cost. Member Willhite and Chair Spanel agreed with these ideas.

The board discussed the options for including this as a policy statement, best management practice to be aware of, or simply an advisory statement. The board directed Ms. Connelly to include it as an eligible cost, but public comment on this issue is not necessary.

Ms. Connelly reminded the board that Attachment B of Item 6 in the board materials is the full list of potential changes that will likely come before the board in future meetings. For the identified policies at this meeting, next steps include a public comment period and revising the policies based on comments received. The final revisions will be brought to the November 18-19 meeting for board decision.

Lunch 12:15 – 12:30 (Break to get lunch and return to meeting)

Item 7: Overview of Changes to the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program

Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Conservation Section Manager, presented an overview of the new federal rules and the recommended changes to the Boating Infrastructure Grant (BIG) program. She provided an overview of the program, outlined policy issues, and options for board consideration. There were eight (out of nine) federal rule changes shared with the board that do not require any action. Three policy topics were then covered for which staff requested board direction. Details of each change and policy options are in the board materials, Item 7.

The board briefly discussed three of the changes: federal funding availability, dredging, and maintenance. Ms. Austin clarified that two of these changes did not require board action. However, the board must decide whether or not BIG funds will be used for maintenance activities.

Ms. Austin proceeded to present the three policy items with various options for the board to consider. She also requested that the board recommend whether each should be opened for public comment.

BIG Funding – Tier 1

Ms. Austin summarized the four funding options outlined in the board materials, explaining that the options account for scenarios that support full use of grant funds. After providing scenario examples and some board discussion of which options provide the most funding for projects, optimizing the use of federal funds, and administrative costs, the board narrowed the preferred options to numbers 3 and 4. Member Mayer expressed support for maximum funds being applied to projects on the ground, and those straying from that direct application would need more board oversight.

BIG Funding – Tier 2

Ms. Austin summarized the options presented for board consideration, explaining how these policies may interact with Tier 1. Chair Spanel clarified that costs not covered in the program administrative costs are subsidized or paid for through another program; Ms. Austin confirmed. Chair Spanel stated this is an important consideration when looking at programs – those that are able to pay for themselves are of great interest. The board discussed potential impacts from indirect rates and limits to indirect rates that may trigger a project coming before the board, and also that projects put forth by RCO should go through the regular application process (app development, etc.).

BIG Long-term Compliance

Ms. Austin summarized three options for board consideration (two were outlined in the board materials). The board discussed. Initially, Member Herzog, Member Willhite, and Member Mayer agreed on option 1, but it seemed to be lacking some flexibility. Based on the examples and discussion of the board, Ms. Austin stated that option 2 may meet the desired needs. She suggested opening option 1 and 2 for public comment, and providing examples for clarification on the differences between the two; the majority of the board agreed with this approach.

Evaluation criteria for Tier 1 – State Grants.

Ms. Austin presented two options, with explanation of the differences between the categories and criteria and the number of points awarded for each. The board discussed the evaluation criteria, centering on the point values of each question and those that must remain due to state requirements (questions 6 and 5, respectively). Ms. Austin will confirm where discretion may be permitted while remaining consistent with the federal requirements. Member Mayer recommended option 2 for public comment; the majority of the board expressed general agreement.

Ms. Austin summarized next steps to modify the proposal, with a public comment period in fall and options for decision at the November 2015 meeting.

Board Business: Briefings & Discussions

Item 9: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Review – Opportunity for the Board to Provide Feedback to the Stakeholder Process

**Item 9 was presented out of order to allow for facilitator participation.*

Director Cottingham provided a brief overview of the purpose and process for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) review. The Legislature directed RCO to convene and facilitate a stakeholder process to review the WWRP beginning this month, and with the goal of having draft recommendations for statutory revisions by late October or early November. A revised set of recommendations will then be forwarded to the Legislature by the December 1 deadline. The feedback will be used to objectively evaluate WWRP and consider the most effective way to meet the recreation and conservation needs for future generations.

Director Cottingham explained the purpose of the meeting session, which is to provide an opportunity for the board to provide input into the review process with the support of a facilitator.

Facilitator Jim Waldo introduced himself, providing some background experience with revisions to the WWRP program. He introduced his co-facilitator, Jane North. Mr. Waldo described his intent for managing the feedback received during the process, including the goal of supporting draft recommendations to the Legislature by the December 1 deadline.

Considering the relatively short timeline, the facilitators and RCO staff crafted a survey that would allow some level of response and serve as a mechanism for interested parties to provide feedback. Additionally, Mr. Waldo and Ms. North have contacted approximately fifty individuals with WWRP experience to informally solicit input and opinions. Currently, they are in the process of contacting key legislators for the same purpose. In late October, a series of groups (approximately 20-25 people each) will convene to discuss the program and exchange ideas and concerns. Mr. Waldo also expressed the intent to engage legislators who have a deep interest or feelings of ownership in the program, hoping to build future support and continuing influence of the program. Finally, he asked for input regarding personal thoughts, comments, and ideas that pertain to the program.

Member Stohr thanked the facilitators for attending. He commented on what he thought the primary goals to be – holding the [Washington Wildlife and Recreation] Coalition together, maintaining support, and reducing fractures. He added that the federal match for this program is critical and would be limited by gaps in state support. Last, he commented on building common values into the program that serve multiple interests, e.g., beyond habitat. He mentioned several issues that should be addressed: multiple interests and coordinated efforts, joint land ownership, Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), and operation and maintenance.

Mr. Waldo responded, stating that in terms of projects with multiple goals (habitat, recreation, etc.), other parties have expressed similar thoughts. He asked if other board members share this or have heard of other similar stories.

Member Bloomfield shared that she has experienced WWRP application process and there are categories of work that should be addressed. She described the collective failure of leadership to provide coalescence between the east and west sides of the state. She stated the need to return to the original intent of the program, and clarifying the need to separate Legislative recommendations. She recommended bringing a proposal to the Legislature for a local government seat on the board. She also recommended revising the Habitat account to remove riparian and farmland, and further dismantling the program to ensure needs across the state are met.

Member Mayer recommended that the highest use of capital funding should advance the state and take into consideration the most significant lands. He further addressed the eligibility silos, implying that they inhibit consideration of the best projects across the state.

Member Herzog stated that he agrees with Member Stohr's comments regarding keeping the Coalition together, as the collective voice helps to amplify issues. However, schisms exist – both on east versus west sides of the state, and also the issue of land acquisitions. To keep the coalition together, perhaps the 50% acquisition requirement should be adjusted so that the program's ranking process will decide versus an over-arching rule. He supported the idea of collaboration to keep the Coalition together, and solutions that support this effort.

Member Willhite thanked Mr. Waldo for his work. He recommended that the group use that past program experience to continue the program today, preserving the functional (good) policies. With a nationally recognized program, he stated that the approach should include recognition of the preceding efforts and maintain those aspects in the program. He stated that it seems that the conflicting agendas from a few voices should be heard, but the public as a whole and the best practices for the state should be paramount. He agreed with the mitigation of silos; however, he noted that more transparency regarding how agencies already work together is necessary, citing wildfire management as an example. Building stakeholder interest and creating buy-in, especially with legislators, is critical to the success of the program. Highlighting these relationships supports the requests to the Legislature, as evidenced by the outcome of the past session. Addressing fiscal issues are also critical, including communicating financial benefits to increase stakeholder involvement. He stated that the survey is a very important part of the process.

Chair Spanel agreed that there needs to be current advocates in the Legislature that are engaged in and support the WWRP. She stated that more effort beyond a meeting is necessary to make a difference, and that their support is key to the program. She shared story, noting that silos also can include a rural versus urban divide. She agreed with the retention of "what is good" in the program, noting that this may include retention of the categories and thus some silos. There is room for improvement, but not to the detriment of the process.

Mr. Waldo asked the board to address the issue of land acquisitions. He shared an example of the disproportionate state-owned land areas within counties that diminish tax revenues; this example highlights the gap between public support and fiscal conflicts. Chair Spanel mentioned that the PILT taxes are often misunderstood.

Member Bloomfield shared that the PILT issue will be discussed at an upcoming meeting of the Washington State Association of Counties in Ellensburg; she relayed that PILT is an anchor to the WWRP that needs to be resolved. Member Bloomfield will be attending and may relay feedback from this group.

Mr. Waldo spoke to the issue of land stewardship, specifically regarding acquisitions, stating that there is incongruence between the volume of land acquisitions and progress on goals.

Member Bloomfield stated that program sideboards and political realities inhibit a clear solution to projects that involve acquisitions. A new program or category that includes non-governmental organizations in such a way that they are working or aligning with state agencies, versus competing, will add value to each project. The way the WWRP is currently structured, these types of collaborative projects are not possible. The WDFW commission and county commissioners are on board with these recommendations; she suggested that this be brought to the Legislature as one of the final recommendations.

Member Mayer suggested an alternate annual fiscal strategy which separates funding for development, acquisition, and stewardship. This may alleviate issues similar to those experienced this past session, where there is a land base in a community but a lack of funding to make use of the area. He spoke to the inclusion of smaller or rural communities, and then advocated a balance between sponsor support and accountability.

Member Willhite spoke to the issue of acquiring land prior to the funding to develop or act on it. He stated that it is not always feasible to bring land to certain standard prior to acquisition, and a stewardship policy of any kind would need to acknowledge this reality. He agreed that a separate program for stewardship would provide an avenue for resolving these issues.

Mr. Waldo addressed Member Stohr's comment about maintaining the coalition, stating that consistency and predictability are necessary in meeting multiple needs. He spoke to comments he has received regarding a fear of losing the ability to direct the program if no action is taken. He then addressed the notion of a working landscape connected to recreation and other habitat values would benefit from information about the economic value or community value in that area.

Item 8: Administrative and Policy Impacts from New Federal Omni-Circular Rules

To conserve time, Chair Spanel requested that Leslie Connelly, Natural Resource Policy Specialist, proceed with presenting the issues for board direction regarding the new Omni-Circular rules. Ms. Connelly requested direction from the board on the recommendations provided in order to address any potential conflicts with the Omni-Circular rules and identify opportunities to align the board's policies with the federal rules where appropriate.

Member Bloomfield asked whether there are waiver projects currently underway that would be affected by the new rules. Ms. Connelly responded that staff do not see immediate conflicts with projects and the new rules.

Member Mayer asked about potential LWCF impacts related to encumbering costs for pre-agreements. Ms. Connelly explained that RCO does need to align with the federal award date. She added that RCO is also asking for permission on a project-by-project basis to allow pre-agreement costs before the federal award date until the program policies can be adjusted.

Ms. Connelly confirmed with Chair Spanel that revisions will be brought to the board at the November meeting.

Break: 2:20 – 2:35 p.m.

Item 10: Board Discussion on Scope of Recreation and Conservation Policy Planning

Leslie Connelly, Natural Resource Policy Specialist, provided background on the federal direction given to the board and RCO to conduct certain strategic planning activities on behalf of the state. Many of the board's funding decisions are expected to be based on a strategic framework that either implicitly or explicitly requires a plan approved either by the board or by an applicant. The federal government also requires specific planning in order to receive certain federal funds. The reason the federal government requires planning is to ensure states spend federal funds in a strategic way.

Ms. Connelly outlined the framework for the board's discussion, outlining the issues and staff recommendations as described in the board materials. Ms. Connelly requested direction from the board on how to proceed with planning tasks. The new SCORP plan, a process which takes about two years,

must be completed by December 2017. Direction from the board now will let staff know what to include in that scoping effort.

Chair Spanel asked how the SCORP addresses overlap between other state agency plans. Ms. Connelly explained that there are sections that address how it fits with RCO needs, and the SCORP planning committee includes subject matter experts in the field, local and state representatives, researchers from Western Washington University, and key stakeholders.

Member Mayer shared that the SCORP revisions should be influenced by the recommendations from the Outdoor Recreation Task Force, JLARC, and the Healthiest Next Generation Task Force outcomes. He mentioned that the Colorado State SCORP plan seems to be a good model as it is more balanced and accessible. He asked the board and staff to consider the turn-over of state agency positions and goals, and whether a SCORP plan could be crafted that includes stability and continued coordination.

Member Stohr responded, suggesting that the problem statement first be identified, then the necessary resources to address this statement should be identified. With multiple plans that include important work, he stated that it would be difficult to re-invest resources without having a new, clearer focus. Member Herzog added that the fiscal intent of agencies at the state level should be part of the SCORP. Long-term plans support the business processes of agencies and promote transparency and coordination.

Member Bloomfield responded to the question of a problem statement, suggesting that a measurement of some form could be beneficial. The metrics currently do not address the big questions of recreation and habitat land opportunities across the state; a plan should articulate the high order needs of the state that include the economic realities, increased population, shrinking land base, etc. and the metrics should address progress in achieving the best outcomes for rec and con in the State. She suggested that the executive summaries of state agencies' core work be appended to the SCORP, repeating her recommendation from the June meeting.

Member Willhite reminded the board of a comment made by today's facilitator, Jim Waldo, regarding the intent of the Legislature. He encouraged stronger communication and solicitation of support from legislative representatives to support the policy planning. He asked about the potential for support to take on this process. Director Cottingham explained that with the current available budget and accompanying requirements, contracting this work is an option and has been done in the past.

Member Mayer stated that, with the goals set in statute, the board has some flexibility in the approach and it is how the plan can articulate the various progress of each agency that will demonstrate how these goals are being achieved. He mentioned a previous board-issued report from 2005, recommending that the framework for the new SCORP begin with putting together various agency plans, targeting the goals in statute, and providing that direction to staff to begin.

Member Stohr supported the board direction, though expressed some uncertainty about potential workloads. Member Herzog spoke to the overarching goal of the SCORP, specifically defining a system and what that system should do for the state. He recommended reviewing the statutory goals and beginning with a discussion of each to define goal statements and provide more clarity.

Director Cottingham clarified that the plan governs this board and investment priorities and influences how others come to the board for funding; however, it will not attempt to govern or provide expectations for other agencies.

Member Bloomfield reiterated the importance of metrics, beyond the monetary allocations, to include how the other organizations engaged in this work will be included. Member Bloomfield added that a

program specifically geared towards monitoring and metrics is complex, but necessary. She provided examples of how metrics could be implemented to measure goal progress that are manageable at the board level.

Member Mayer referred to the State of Colorado's plan, suggesting a similar approach to the clarity of goals and strategies. He offered his support and time to staff to help craft a meaningful plan. Member Willhite agreed with the need to include metrics, and recommended looking at other mission statements and goals to inform the plan so that it aligns with other goals statewide.

Staff will prepare a draft scope of work and detailed budget based on the direction of the board and present it at the November meeting.

Riverfront Park Tour

Kyle Guzlas invited staff from the City of Spokane Parks and Recreation to provide a brief overview of the walking tour scheduled for this afternoon. He then summarized the second day's tour and highlighted the main sites that will be visited.

Closing

The meeting was adjourned at p.m. by Chair Spanel.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: September 17, 2015

Place: Spokane, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Harriet Spanel	Chair, Bellingham	Peter Herzog	Designee, State Parks & Recreation Commission
Betsy Bloomfield	Yakima	Joe Stohr	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pete Mayer	Renton		
Ted Willhite	Twisp		

Tour

The board began the tour of projects at 8:30 a.m. and proceeded as indicated on the agenda. The tour concluded at 3:00 p.m. Member Herman and Member Deller were both excused from the tour.

Approved by:


Harriet Chair Spanel, Chair

November 19, 2015

Date

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2015-18
September 2015 Consent Calendar**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following September 2015 Consent Calendar items are approved:

- A. Approve Board Meeting Minutes – June 24-25, 2015

Resolution moved by: Ted Willhite

Resolution seconded by: Joe Stohr

Adopted Date: September 16, 2015

Revised

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2015-19**

**National Land and Water Conservation Fund Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program
Delegation of Authority to the Director**

WHEREAS, the National Parks Service will solicit federal fiscal year 2015 grant applications for the National Land and Water Conservation Fund Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program (LWCFPP), and

WHEREAS, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Advisory Committee will review and evaluate these projects to help ensure consistency with the objectives of the LWCFPP and will create a ranked list of projects or recommendation for consideration, and

WHEREAS, this assessment by the committee promotes the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) objectives to conduct its work with integrity and in an open manner; and

WHEREAS, the projects must meet the program requirements stipulated in Manual #15, *Land and Water Conservation Fund Program, Land and Water Conservation Fund Federal Financial Assistance. Manual*, and rules established in the *Federal Funding Opportunity*, thus supporting the board's strategy to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

WHEREAS, the timing for the solicitation of projects and the deadlines for submittal to the National Park Service may not meet established timelines for the board's scheduled meetings; and

WHEREAS, consideration of this grant opportunity supports the board's strategy to provide funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance recreation opportunities statewide;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the director is authorized to solicit and to submit applications to the National Park Service for evaluation and funding consideration in federal fiscal year 2015 consistent with the LWCF Advisory Committee's recommendation; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the board authorizes the director authority submit and execute all project agreements and amendments necessary to facilitate implementation of the approved projects and report back to the board regarding the outcome.

Resolution moved by: Pete Mayer

Resolution seconded by: Betsy Bloomfield

Adopted Date: September 16, 2015