

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS, MARCH 31, 2011

Agenda Items without Formal Action

Item	Board Request for Follow-up
Item 2: Management Report	Staff to work with board members to develop a letter following release of House budget, noting the importance of WWRP and other state funding. (Completed on April 4, 2011)
Item 3: Perspectives on Recreational Trails Program Funding and Project Categorization	No follow up requested
Item 8a: Sustainability Practices and Policy Development	Staff should provide a more specific checklist of sustainable practices in the application metric, with links to resources for technical assistance, design, etc. Web site should be updated with similar information so RCO serves as a clearinghouse for ideas. WWRP Local Parks evaluation question to be revised for next grant round.
Item 8b: Level of Service Recommendations	No follow up requested
Item 8c: Allowable Uses Policy	The board asked that the policy proposal scheduled for June 2011 provide a stronger consideration than "reasonably justified," be cautious with the term "cell tower," and clarify the policy regarding existing uses or structures.
Item 9: Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration and Interpretive Trail (Project #06-1604D)	No follow up requested
Item 10: Overview of Upcoming Conversion: Sullivan Park, City of Everett, Project #79-011	No follow up requested
Item 11: Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): New Requirements	Presentation delayed until June 2011

Agenda Items with Formal Action

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up
Item 1: Consent Calendar	APPROVED revised resolution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – October 28-29, 2010 as amended Time Extension Request: Auburn Environmental Park, City of Auburn, Project #06-1834 Recognition of Volunteer Evaluators 	No follow up requested
Item 4: Proposed Change in Land and Water Conservation Fund Evaluation Criteria	APPROVED <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changed question #9 in evaluation criteria regarding sponsor compliance. 	No follow up requested
Item 5: Proposed Change to Increase Maximum Grant Amount in FARR Program	APPROVED <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased maximum grant amount to \$100,000. 	No follow up requested
Item 6: Proposed Change to Biennial Grant Cycle	APPROVED as amended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changed all programs to a biennial grant cycle, with changes to begin as shown on table in board materials. Increased the RTP maximum to \$150,000 beginning January 2012. 	No follow up requested
Item 7: Delegation of Authority to Director to Resolve 6(f) Boundary Issues	APPROVED as amended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delegated authority to the director to ascertain and recommend a boundary to NPS for Kah Tai Park (81-043). 	No follow up requested

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: March 31, 2011

Place: Room 172, Natural Resources Building, Olympia, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Bill Chapman, Chair	Mercer Island	Stephen Saunders	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Betsy Bloomfield	Yakima	Larry Fairleigh	Designee, State Parks
Harriet Spanel	Bellingham	Dave Brittell	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pete Mayer	Vancouver		
Steven Drew	Olympia		

It is intended that this summary be used with the notebook provided in advance of the meeting. A recording is retained by RCO as the formal record of meeting.

Opening and Management Reports

Chair Bill Chapman called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Staff called roll, and a quorum was determined. Chair Chapman introduced the new members of the board – Betsy Bloomfield and Pete Mayer – and asked members to introduce themselves. New State Parks Director Don Hoch was unable to attend, but was represented by designee Larry Fairleigh.

Member Brittell moved to approve the agenda. Member Spanel seconded. The agenda was approved as presented.

The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) reviewed Resolution #2011-01, Consent Calendar. Director Kaleen Cottingham noted that they were considering a revised resolution because the minutes had been amended before the meeting. The consent calendar included the following:

- Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – October 28-29, 2010 as amended
- Time Extension Request: Auburn Environmental Park, City of Auburn, Project #06-1834
- Recognition of Volunteer Evaluators

**Revised Resolution 2011-01 moved by: DREW and seconded by: SPANEL
Resolution APPROVED**

Item 2: Management Report

Director Cottingham noted the high number of audits and the agency's efforts to streamline processes, especially since the budget in the next biennium will mean reduced staff. Chair Chapman asked for additional information about the backup needed on invoices. The director explained the state audit and resulting risk model, and its implications for sponsors. The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) has recently started implementing the risk categories for the recreation and conservation side of the agency. Deputy Director Rachael Langen noted that the process is laborious

for staff and sponsors, and staff is working on some sort of electronic billing to make it easier. Member Mayer asked if this was a permanent change. Director Cottingham noted that the approach is permanent, but that sponsors could perform well enough to move to a lower category.

Legislative and Budget Update: Policy Director Steve McLellan provided an update on various pieces of legislation, including consolidation of natural resource agencies, the extension of the invasive species council, fee bills, board and commission elimination, and capital budget restrictions. Of particular interest to the board is a proposed limit of four years for a project. Director Cottingham noted that the bill is structured to give project alternates four years, if they are started within the first four years of the original project. There also would be a mechanism to have projects taken to OFM for certain time extensions (e.g., permit issues). The board discussed the potential effect on sponsors and the number of projects potentially affected.

McLellan then explained the various approaches to the operating budget from the Governor, senate, and House. The anticipated gap is \$5.3 billion in the next 27 months. Both the Senate and House are expected to make across-the-board cuts in the operating budget, including cuts in employees and salaries. He then noted the differing approaches to the capital budget, which also will be cut significantly. He noted that the Office of Financial Management (OFM) created a tool to calculate jobs created. Members noted that looking at jobs created is a major philosophical shift, and expressed a number of concerns, especially with regard to WWRP. Concerns included that it was narrow, not in line with the original program intent, ignored the economic benefit of "green infrastructure", and did not account for the non-state funding leveraged. Members also noted that they have a role in ensuring that the process for grant awards remains fair.

Director Cottingham noted that staff and the board cannot advocate for one approach over another. She noted that Member Spanel would do some outreach after the budget was released. Member Drew suggested a communication from the board about the extent to which projects support other state initiatives such as Puget Sound and Healthy Washington. McLellan noted that such communications might be helpful after they have a budget to respond to, especially if it highlights the priorities and consistency with the Governor's message. The Chair noted appreciation for the points that board members raised, and stated that it was important for the board to come to agreement on the key points for Member Spanel to use.

Policy Report: Policy Director Steve McLellan then noted the SCORP update within the policy update memo. The future of the funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) is very uncertain; he will update the board at the June meeting. The RCO is hoping to receive LWCF planning money for completing SCORP. Member Larry Fairleigh thanked staff for working on cabin eligibility.

Grant Management Report: There were no questions on the grant management report, so grant management staff moved directly to presentations of closed projects. Kammie Bunes presented information about the Crown S ranch in Okanogan County, and Laura Moxham presented information about the Civic Sports Fields Renovation in Woodinville.

Performance Report: Director Cottingham noted that performance may lag as the agency experiences reductions in staff. The board had no questions about the performance report.

State Agency Partner Reports

Larry Fairleigh, State Parks, noted that they have a new director. He noted that there would be staffing cuts and service reductions. They also will have a possible proposal for the use of St. Edward State Park, but it is contingent on RCO conversion policies. They also have potential conversion issues at Fort Worden. He asked for staff to be able to offer small communities advice on navigating the DAHP and Corps permitting processes. Finally, he discussed the various ideas that will be part of the new state parks strategic plan.

Stephen Saunders, Department of Natural Resources (DNR), noted that the status of their request legislation, including the Puget Sound Corps bill, which would create a WCC type project team. They have 18 bills before the House and Senate, combined.

Dave Brittell, Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), gave a brief update on Discover Pass and the partnership to get user fees (SB 5266). He also noted the federal funding situation also is affecting the ability of DFW and DNR to secure grants.

Item 3: Perspectives on Recreational Trails Program Funding and Project Categorization

Greg Lovelady, Recreation Planner, presented the staff overview of the programs' funding and categorization process, as adopted by the board and described in the staff memo. Gary Johnson, representing the Washington Off-Highway Vehicle Alliance, presented his concerns about the board's approach with regard to the compatible use category.

Chair Chapman asked him what he would like to see changed. He asked that that the motorized and nonmotorized category projects equally share the 40 percent of funds required for allocation to the "diversified use" category.

General Public Comment

Robert Meier, Rayonier, followed up on his presentation from the October 2010 meeting regarding use of different appraisal methods. He stated that he has not found similar programs in other states. He noted several Washington state programs, including the school trust land transfer program, which he believes are similar. Mr. Meier provided a handout to all board members.

Member Brittell noted that he appreciates Mr. Meier's efforts and discussions with WDFW. Member Saunders cautioned that one constraint is overlap with federal grant projects, which require use of the federal yellow book appraisal process. Board members and Mr. Meier also discussed the riparian open space program, which compensates timber owners for lost value. Steve McLellan noted that staff is continuing to talk to Mr. Meier, and that they will discuss how to proceed after session.

Board Decisions

Item 4: Proposed Change in Land and Water Conservation Fund Evaluation Criteria

Jim Eychaner, Senior Policy Specialist, explained that the proposed change to question #9 of the LWCF criteria. The change should make it easier for staff to score and clearer for all to understand. The RCO received no public comment on the change.

Board members noted that the case made in the memo was compelling, and had no questions.

Resolution 2011-02 moved by: Saunders and seconded by: Spanel
Resolution APPROVED

Item 5: Proposed Change to Increase Maximum Grant Amount in Firearms and Archery Range Recreation (FARR) Program

Jim Eychaner, Senior Policy Specialist, explained the proposal to increase the grant maximum from \$50,000 to \$100,000 beginning with the current cycle. He stated that public comment was supportive. Board members had no questions.

Resolution 2011-03 moved by: Spanel and seconded by: Brittell
Resolution APPROVED

Chair Chapman congratulated Mr. Eychaner on his National Distinguished Service Award in Recreation Planning.

Item 6: Proposed Change to Biennial Grant Cycle for All Grant Programs

Jim Eychaner, Senior Policy Specialist, presented a proposal that the application process for all board-funded grant programs take place biennially, as described in the staff memo. He noted that the intent is to recognize the need to limit staff work in light of budget and staffing reductions. He addressed the mixed public reaction to the proposal, noting that some of those who had commented were in the audience. Eychaner noted that moving to the new cycle would allow staff to spend more time focusing on active grant management.

Board members expressed concerns about the application to annual federal grants, especially where second year funds may be uncertain. Marguerite Austin, Recreation Section Manager, noted that due to timing, the board already must approve project lists for federal programs before funding becomes available.

Members also discussed whether grant maximums should be increased for the programs that currently have annual awards, noting that doing so could limit the number of recipients and grants. Ms. Austin noted that the greatest concern was with the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) where the primary applicants included nonprofit organizations. The program provides funds for maintenance

activities. She noted that the annual review is time intensive for staff and sponsors, in part because most nonprofits apply for the current maximum each year, often returning with the same request.

Staff explained that increasing the grant maximum could limit the number of recipients, but that staff would move down the list in the second year. Mr. Fairleigh clarified that the limit is being raised only for those programs that are non-capital.

Chair Chapman spoke in support of the resolution and in support of increasing the maximum grant amount for the RTP program. He noted that it is really prorating the current maximum to two years.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Glenn Glover, Evergreen Mountain Bike, said that his organization is now neutral on the change, but thinks that the maximum should be increased. He noted that there needs to be additional flexibility for RTP; the federal funding creates a confusing timing situation. He likes the idea of completing an application for funding to complete a specific task.

Resolution 2011-04 moved by: Drew and seconded by: Saunders

Chair Chapman moved to add the following language: “Be it further resolved that the grant limit for the RTP beginning in January 2012 is set at \$150,000.”

Member Saunders seconded the motion.

Voting in favor of the motion: 7 Voting against: 1 (Member Drew)

Resolution APPROVED unanimously as amended.

Item 7: Delegation of Authority to Director to Resolve 6(f) Boundary Issues at Kah Tai Lagoon Park, Port Townsend

Director Cottingham gave a brief overview of the conversion process and how staff is changing its approach to give the board more opportunity for comment before they are asked for a decision.

Jim Anest, Compliance Specialist, presented background information about Kah Tai Lagoon Park, as described in the staff memo, noting that it is not yet a conversion or compliance issue. He explained that due to the complex nature of the boundary issues, staff was asking the board to delegate authority to the Director to meet with the National Park Service (NPS) and sponsors to help them resolve their differences on the boundary; this approach was recommended by NPS. Mr. Anest noted that RCO staff had worked with the parties for over a year, and they had not been able to resolve their differences.

Mr. Anest also corrected a notation in the staff memo regarding the number of leases at the park location. The RCO file contains only one lease. The sponsors did not inform RCO that two other leases

exist, until after the memo was published. In response to board questions, he also clarified that only one sponsor disputes the NPS interpretation of the boundary. He noted that the situation demonstrates common problems in older grants. This takes considerable time and effort; staff is asking for clarification of the director's role in resolving the matter. Mr. Anest concluded by summarizing some of the key points of the public comments sent to the board.

Member Brittell asked if the decision presupposes a conclusion. Director Cottingham noted that the board makes a recommendation, but that the NPS makes the final decision.

Member Fairleigh asked if the board or director's role influences whether or not the aquatic center would be built. Mr. Anest noted that the steps of a conversion require starting with knowing what property is proposed for conversion; they are still at that point. Mr. Anest stated that the port's position is that there is no conversion because they disagree with the boundary. Ms. Austin noted that LWCF rules allow pools to be covered, so NPS has indicated that the aquatic structure could be either a conversion or compatible use. As a result, staff is trying to keep this focused on the boundary issue.

Member Drew noted concern with the potential that the board would be changing a boundary by resolution. Director Cottingham clarified the issue is not to change the boundary, but to ascertain the facts as they were in 1981. Mr. Anest noted that there is a 20-acre difference in the grant documents. In response to a follow-up question, he clarified that the evidence of the boundary or intent is conflicting and ambiguous.

Mr. Mayer clarified is that they do not have a boundary issue today, but an anticipated boundary issue if the port opts to request a future conversion following the lease expiration.

The Chair noted that the director normally handles disputes for 6(f) boundaries. There is no request to delegate authority to resolve a conversion. The NPS asked the director to help, and this request is simply for clarification of her role. Member Fairleigh concurred, noting that the aquatic center was a local issue that may or may not be conversion. Member Saunders said he saw no reason to deviate from the normal process.

Director Cottingham noted that this is a fact-finding mission, and that it does not need to be a consensus recommendation to the NPS. There is potential for litigation regardless of the resolution.

Member Drew stated that he was more comfortable with the director having authority to set the boundary than he was with the idea of negotiating a boundary. He suggested that the resolution say "determine" rather than negotiate.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Richard Jahnke, citizen, discussed the public record on Kah Tai Park and his efforts to preserve the historical record. He noted that RCO has tried to figure out the history, and referenced the materials he provided to the board. He believes that the board memo has factual errors and omits critical

contract information. He stated that the city does not disagree with the NPS – the only entity that disputes the boundary is the port. Any boundary that does not include the port lands is inaccurate.

Ron Sikes, citizen, stated that he has been involved with the park since 1977. In 1984, he and other volunteers planted the park based on a map showing all port lands. They believed it was a permanent park. He noted a recent city survey found it was the second most-used park in the city. It is near local schools, and is used as an outdoor classroom. He is asking the RCO to recommend to the NPS that it maintain the 6(f) boundary.

Lang Russel, citizen, stated that the city and the port both signed the contract in 1981 for a permanent park. In 1982, they negotiated a 30-year lease for the 20 acres that the port had pledged for the park. The lease was not intended as match for the acquisition grant and was not a substitute for the port's obligation to transfer title to the 20 acres to the city. The port's stance that their obligation ends with the lease is false, as is the claim that the procedural lapses relieve them of the obligation.

Alea Waters, citizen, gave historical information about volunteer efforts to preserve and maintain the park. The port is now pushing for development, and the aquatic center is only a first step toward more development. She is concerned that the citizens have been left out of the discussion. She asked the board to do three things: (1) recognize that it is inappropriate for the Port's attorney to request to have staff negotiate the boundary, (2) acknowledge the citizen efforts and trust that have gone into the park, and (3) join the citizens, the city, and NPS in formalizing the 78.5-acre boundary.

Jim Todd, citizen, said that he represented Friends of Kah Tai. He noted that over 1,430 people have signed a petition against any project that would diminish the qualities of the park. These people come from all over the county. There is widespread and strong support for keeping the park as it was envisioned in the grant proposal. He believes that the contract was for a wildlife park, and the funds were to achieve that objective. He stated that the evidence is in favor of the boundary supported by Friends of Kah Tai and the city. He urged the board to support the 6(f) boundary in that map.

George Yount, citizen, stated that he is the former manager of the Port of Port Townsend noted that the purpose of the lease was quid pro quo for giving the Port jurisdiction over the road right-of-ways in another location. As a quid pro quo, they leased the property in Kah Tai for park purposes. The intent was to settle the complexities of the land exchange during the 30 year lease.

Carolyn Lake, Port of Port Townsend, noted that the port is a public entity that is charged with protecting the public interest. The port supports the resolution because it is illogical for public boards to expend funds on litigation. She provided her legal analysis for the board to review.

Larry Crockett, Port of Port Townsend, stated that the aquatic center is a separate issue. The property is owned by the entire county, and that the other port commissioners who were sitting at the time of the lease disagree with Mr. Yount's assessment of the intent. He believes that the lease was for match on the grant.

Rosemary Sikes, Admiralty Audubon, stated that it is critical that the board support the 6(f) boundary. It is vital to protect these treasures. She is upset that the lack of oversight and deeds has threatened the park. The park is a key birding places on the Olympic Peninsula. They identified 90 species of birds using the park for nesting and feeding. Volunteers have done considerable work to protect the park for wildlife purposes; it is clear that people love the park.

Mary McDowell, citizen, referred to her letter and the factual errors she found in the memo. She believes that the request for delegation misstates facts. The grant was in 1981, but the lease was later and could not have been for match. She thinks the resolution should be rejected and should include correct statements of fact.

Resolution 2011-05 moved by: Fairleigh and seconded by: Brittell

Chair Chapman noted that staff would correct the “Whereas” statements to reflect the date of the application and status of the dispute.

Member Drew moved to amend the resolution to change the last statement to read “NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby delegates authority to the Recreation and Conservation Office director to ascertain and recommend to the National Park Service a 6(f) boundary for project number 81-043A.” Member Fairleigh seconded.

Member Saunders suggested a friendly amendment to reconcile the title to the change in the resolution. Member Drew accepted it.

Member Spanel suggested a friendly amendment to remove the last whereas statement. Member Drew accepted it.

Motion carried.

Resolution APPROVED as amended.

Board Briefings

Item 8A: Sustainability Practices and Policy Development

Jim Eychaner, Senior Policy Specialist, and Lucienne Guyot, Agency Sustainability Coordinator, presented their findings regarding the current use of sustainable practices in board-funded projects. The data were submitted by sponsors during the most recent WWRP grant cycle; respondents represented communities of various sizes statewide. Mr. Eychaner and Ms. Guyot noted that sponsors already are using a number of sustainable practices without direct incentives from the board. Ms. Guyot detailed her conversations about sustainability with the sponsors. They concluded that RCO policies encourage sustainability, sponsors are taking action without incentives, and that further work

should be done when resources become available. Kaleen noted that SCORP would be updated in 2013, and that it would be a good vehicle for incorporating sustainability in planning.

The board discussed its options and role for encouraging sustainability, and the potential effects on sponsors, the environment, green infrastructure, and ability to maintain the investments. There was general agreement that the board could be a clearinghouse for sharing ideas and designs, and for ways to educate the public about sustainability. Specific direction was as follows:

- The application metric question highlighted in the presentation should be revised as a short checklist that asks the sponsor to explain how they met certain elements (e.g., lighting, surfacing, drainage, or maintenance). It should not be a list of approved products or approaches, and should be carefully done so that it does not appear to state preferred approaches. The checklist should include links to reference materials or technical assistance.
- During the grant rounds, staff should highlight "Sustainably Designed Projects of Note" to the board.
- Discussions about sustainability should be incorporated into applicant workshops.
- The RCO web site should include information from the checklist, resources for technical assistance and design, and projects of note.

The board also asked staff to develop a process and revise evaluation questions regarding sustainable practices. The chair noted that past practice has been to implement major policy changes incrementally, and the board agreed to start with one program. Staff will revise the question for WWRP Local Parks to have greater focus on sustainable practices, beginning with the 2012 grant round.

Item 8B: Level of Service Recommendations

Jim Eychaner, Senior Policy Specialist, presented the results of the study and testing of the level of service (LOS) approach to measuring demand for recreation opportunity. Staff recommends that use of the LOS should be recommended but not required as a way to help local communities assess the effectiveness of their park and recreation programs. More work is needed with state agencies.

The board thanked Mr. Eychaner for his work, but had no other comments or questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Sharon Claussen, King County Parks, noted that park standards are a challenge because standards do not always fit the many roles that a park department may play. She appreciates the use of a recommendation or guideline rather than a requirement.

Item 8C: Allowable Uses Policy

Dominga Soliz, Policy Specialist, presented information about the proposed policy regarding allowable uses, as described in the staff memo. This new policy will be brought to the board for decision in June 2011. She noted that she did not want a decision today, but that she wanted the board's comments and questions so they could incorporate it in the policy proposal.

Board member comments were as follows:

- Member Drew suggested that the concept of reasonably justified is not strong enough; it needs to show whether every reasonable alternative has been evaluated and rejected on a sound basis.
- Member Mayer asked that staff clarify the policy regarding pre-existing uses or structures, including utilities. Staff cited the various other applicable policies that already exist.
- Member Mayer urged caution in using the term "cell tower" because it can refer to a variety of structures of different sizes and functions.

Item 9: Project Overview and Preview of Upcoming Time Extension, Qwuloolt Estuary Restoration and Interpretive Trail Project, Tulalip Tribe, Project #06-1604D

Elizabeth Butler, Grant Manager, provided an overview of this project, as described in the staff memo. Staff expects the sponsor will need to request a time extension at the June 2011 meeting. Staff is presenting the information at this time so that board questions can be answered as the time extension request is prepared. Kurt Nelson, Tulalip Tribes Environmental Division Manager joined her to answer questions.

Member Saunders asked whether the sponsor would request a time extension if they cannot obtain the permits. Mr. Nelson responded that they will have the local permits by June, and stated that the Corps project manager reported that they are on schedule with the agreement they made last fall.

Item 10: Overview of Upcoming Conversion: Sullivan Park, City of Everett, Project #79-011

Jim Anest, Compliance Specialist, provided an overview of the circumstances surrounding the conversion as described in the memo. Staff expects that the sponsor will request approval of the conversion and replacement property at the June 2011 meeting. This grant includes LWCF funds, so the board will make a recommendation and the NPS will make the final determination. Staff is presenting the information at this time so that board questions or concerns can be addressed before that meeting.

The board asked staff to address the following in the June presentation:

Circumstances of the Conversion

- Why did it take so long for the city to acknowledge the conversion?
- Are there any restrictions on the conversion area, such as fencing?

Access Road

- Was the access road necessary for the fire station?
- What is the history on the road that's in there? Was it added as a connector for the neighborhood adjacent to it? When was the road built, and what was the purpose for the road?

Replacement Property

- What was the city's intent in buying the 15 acres under the waiver of retroactivity?
- What is the intent for the acres that are not being used as replacement?
- If the replacement property will be park property anyway, how is it replacement?
- What is the basis of the value for the replacement property, and how does the zoning (wetland vs. commercial) affect that?
- What are the topographical characteristics of property? How much is wetland?
- What is the history of the property – history of ownership, definition of land when acquired, zoning, acquisition cost?
- Is there a public access gain?

Alternatives

- Could the footprint of the take be reduced at this point? For example, is there an option of removing the road?
- Did they ever seek to segregate the parcel the fire station is on?

General Comments

- What is the open area just above the word "Sullivan" on the graphic? What is the circulation pattern?
- Graphics should be larger, clearer, and more detailed.

Item 11: Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): New Requirements for Grant-Funded Projects

Due to staff time restrictions related to the state temporary layoff day on March 28, this agenda item was tabled until the June 2011 meeting.

The board asked that the resolutions be provided on paper in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Approved by:

Bill Chapman, Chair

Date

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2011-01 REVISED
March 2011 Consent Agenda

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following March 2011 Consent Agenda items are approved:

- a. Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Meeting Minutes – October 28-29, 2010 as amended
- b. Time Extension Request:
 - i. Auburn Environmental Park, City of Auburn, Project #06-1834
- c. Recognition of Volunteer Evaluators and Committee Members

Resolution moved by: Steven Drew

Resolution seconded by: Harriet Spanel

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 31, 2011

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2011-02
Approving Changes to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Evaluation
Criteria

WHEREAS, Chapter 79A.25.130 RCW authorizes the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) to participate in or receive aid from any federal program respecting outdoor recreation or conservation; and

WHEREAS, the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) is a federal program managed by the National Park Service (NPS) that grants funds to the state for recreation purposes; and

WHEREAS, RCO is recognized as the state agency responsible for management of LWCF funds in Washington State; and

WHEREAS, the NPS requires a priority rating system for selection of potential LWCF projects; and

WHEREAS, the priority rating system must include criteria that address a federal priority to reward sponsors for compliance with LWCF rules and regulations; and

WHEREAS, the revised question number nine shown in Attachment A to the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) memo meets the National Park Service requirements; and

WHEREAS, the revision to question nine supports the board's objectives to (1) ensure funded projects are managed efficiently and in conformance with existing legal authorities, and (2) fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board the revised question number nine and directs staff to implement the system for use in the 2011 and future grant rounds.

Resolution moved by: Stephen Saunders

Resolution seconded by: Harriet Spanel

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 31, 2011

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2011-03
Approving an Increase Maximum Grant Amount in the
Firearms and Archery Range Recreation (FARR) Program

WHEREAS, the Firearms and Archery Range Recreation (FARR) program is authorized by RCW 79A.25.210, and

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) has the authority to adopt policies to manage the firearms range account, which funds the FARR program, and

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) has recognized that the cost of the projects funded by FARR grants is increasing due in part to construction and permitting fees, and

WHEREAS, RCO staff proposed increasing the grant limit from \$50,000 per application to \$100,000 per application and received only supportive comments from stakeholders, and

WHEREAS, the board can promotes its goals of making strategic investments and helping partners to develop recreation opportunities by providing a meaningful level of funding to projects selected and evaluated through a competitive process,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board permanently sets the maximum grant limit for FARR projects at \$100,000 beginning with the 2011 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Harriet Spanel

Resolution seconded by: Dave Brittell

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 31, 2011

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2011-04
Approving Biennial Application and Award Cycles for Board-Funded
Grant Programs

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) has the authority and responsibility to establish cycles for evaluating project proposals and awarding grants for the programs under its purview, and

WHEREAS, the board has established a variety of annual and biennial cycles over the years, and

WHEREAS, Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) management has commissioned studies in 2008 and 2009 to improve business processes, and

WHEREAS, both studies recommended streamlining the grant application processes, including the use of a biennial cycle for all programs, and

WHEREAS, the staff assessment found that such a move would improve organizational efficiency and support the agency and board goals to better manage projects and improve long-term project compliance, and

WHEREAS, the staff assessment and public comment also found that a single process would be less time-consuming for applicants and volunteer evaluators, and

WHEREAS, using a single biennial schedule supports the board's goal to achieve a high level of accountability in managing its resources and responsibilities while continuing to provide funding to its partners and award grants through fair, impartial, and open public processes,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board does hereby authorize the RCO to use a biennial cycle for all grant programs, and to take steps to implement it in a timely manner; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director is authorized to execute supplemental grant cycles when funding levels or other circumstances warrant; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the grant limit for the Recreational Trails Program, beginning in January 2012, is set at \$150,000.

Resolution moved by: Steven Drew

Resolution seconded by: Stephen Saunders

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 31, 2011

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2011-05

Delegating Authority to the Director to Ascertain and Recommend to the
National Park Service a 6(f) Boundary for Project #81-043A

WHEREAS, In 1981, the City of Port Townsend (City) and the Port of Port Townsend (Port) were awarded a grant to acquire 78.5 acres for Kah Tai Park in Port Townsend; and

WHEREAS, the grant included funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) , which is funded by the National Park Service (NPS), and is thus subject its rules and determinations regarding boundaries; and

WHEREAS, the NPS makes the final determination regarding the boundary; and

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board), through the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) are responsible for ensuring ongoing compliance with LWCF-funded grants in Washington State; and

WHEREAS, one grant sponsor is now in dispute with the NPS about how the grant-protected boundary of the park is defined; and

WHEREAS, as the grant management agency, RCO has been working with NPS and the sponsors for over a year on this issue;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby delegates authority to the Recreation and Conservation Office director to ascertain and recommend to the National Park Service a 6f boundary for project number 81-043A.

Resolution moved by: Fairleigh

Resolution seconded by: Brittell

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 31, 2011