



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE
1111 Washington Street SE
PO Box 40917
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

January 23, 2006

TO: IAC Members and Designees

FROM: Laura E. Johnson, Director *LEJ*

PREPARED BY: Marguerite Austin, Manager
Recreation & Habitat Section, Project Services Division

SUBJECT: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
State Lands Categories
Notebook Item #7

Background

The Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program (WWRP) directs project funding through four "Accounts" – the Outdoor Recreation Account (ORA), the Habitat Conservation Account (HCA), and, since 2005, the Farmlands Preservation and the Riparian Protection Accounts.

The Outdoor Recreation and Habitat Conservation Accounts in turn direct their share of funding into several categories such as "Trails", "Water Access" and "Critical Habitat". Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5396, passed by the 2005 Legislature, created two additional categories, one in the ORA and one in the HCA. Both new categories address new project types for certain state-owned lands. The first new category is "State Lands Restoration and Enhancement", in the HCA. The second is "State Lands Development and Renovation", in the ORA.

IAC must submit ranked lists of WWRP projects to the Governor on or before November 1, 2006 for consideration in the next biennial budget. To meet this requirement, the application deadline for all categories and accounts of WWRP is May 1, 2006. Staff has been working with an ad hoc advisory team to draft policies for these new categories. This memo outlines the proposed policies for the new categories and includes staff's recommendation for Board approval and adoption of the policy manuals provided in Notebook Item #11.



New Categories

The State Lands Restoration and Enhancement category was established in to provide funds for restoration and enhancement of “existing habitat and natural area lands” (in the HCA). The State Lands Development and Renovation category was established to provide funds for renovation and development of “existing recreational lands” (in the ORA).

The Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources are the only applicants eligible to apply for funds in these two categories. Attachment A includes statutory language from Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5396. Attachment B outlines general information provided to the Board in September 2005.

Some of the key policies proposed for these categories are highlighted below:

STATE LANDS RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT (HCA)

1. How do we define restoration and enhancement?

The statute does not provide a definition for restoration or enhancement. After considering the general definitions used by most state agencies, these definitions are recommended for adoption.

Restoration means bringing a site back to its original function through activities that can be reasonably expected to result in a site that is self-sustaining; that is, the site will not require continual intervention to function as a predominately natural ecosystem.

Enhancement improves the functionality of a site.

2. What are the proposed criteria for eligibility in the Restoration and Enhancement category?

- Restoration or enhancement must occur on existing state land.
- May include habitat enhancement or creation.
- May include reintroduction of native vegetation, altering or removing structures,
- May include wetlands, forests, shrub-steppe, riparian zones, and salt or freshwater habitats.
- May exclude public use, if needed to protect habitat and species.
- Should be managed primarily for resource preservation and protection.

3. What types of projects are eligible for restoration or enhancement?

Eligible project elements include:

- Estuary and shoreline restoration
- Fencing, gates, and signs

- Instream habitat such as bank stabilization, channel reconfiguration, and woody debris placement
- Instream passage improvements
- Habitat enhancement such as native plantings and invasive plant removal
- Removal of structures like bulkheads, dikes, tide gates, and impervious surfaces
- Transplanting and re-vegetation, and
- Upland erosion control.

Restoration projects should follow the *Washington State Aquatic Habitat Guidelines* Program for road culverts, stream restoration and streambank protection.

4. What evaluation process will be used to assess these projects?

The recommendation is to use a written evaluation process. See Question 13 below.

5. How should we structure the evaluation team?

The evaluation team should include eight members. There would be at least one representative from the Department of Fish and Wildlife and a representative from the Department of Natural Resources. Depending on availability, preference would be given to citizen representatives from organizations such as land trusts and wildlife and recreation groups with expertise in applicable disciplines such as: natural resource or fish and wildlife management. Teams may also include representatives from other governmental entities.

6. What are key criteria to consider when evaluating restoration and enhancement projects?

The bill does not mention any specific criteria that must be used to assess projects in this category. RCW 79A.15.060(6) identifies criteria that the Board should consider when determining priorities for other categories in the Habitat Conservation Account. Using those criteria as a guide along with priorities outlined in the state's comprehensive outdoor recreation plan, *An Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State: 2002-2007*, the evaluation criteria in Attachment C were developed.

STATE LANDS DEVELOPMENT AND RENOVATION (ORA)

7. How do we define development/renovation versus deferred maintenance?

All elements must meet the Office of Financial Management's capital project criteria, defined in the biennial publication *Washington State Capital Plan Instructions*.

8. What are the proposed criteria for eligibility in the State Lands Renovation and Development category?

- Renovation or development must occur on existing state recreation land.
- May include public access facilities for upland recreation like picnicking, camping, hunting, environmental education, etc.
- May include facilities for water related recreation activities such as fishing, swimming, and small boat access.
- Trails must be for non-motorized use and cannot be part of a street or roadway such as a sidewalk or unprotected road shoulder. Trails adjacent to a roadway that are separated by a physical barrier and are improved solely for pedestrian, equestrian, or bicycle use are eligible.

9. What types of projects are eligible?

This category provides funds for development of new facilities and renovation of existing facilities. Eligible facilities include, but are not limited to:

- Boating facilities
- Campsites
- Fishing access
- Hunting access
- Interpretive sites
- Picnic areas
- Scenic overlooks
- Trails and trailheads for non-motorized recreation, and
- Wildlife viewing areas.

Funds may only be used for improvements to properties already owned or managed by the applicants.

10. What evaluation process will be used to assess these projects?

The recommendation is to use a written evaluation process. See Question 13, below.

11. Who are the evaluators?

The evaluation team should include eight members. There would be at least one representative from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Department of Natural Resources, and State Parks. There would be two-three local agency representatives, and two-three citizens representations. Depending on availability, preference would be given to representatives from land trusts, wildlife and recreation groups, conservation clubs, trail groups, and federal agency experts

12. What evaluation criteria will be used?

The bill does not mention any specific criteria that must be used to assess projects in this category. RCW 79A.15.070 (6) identifies criteria that the Board should

consider when determining priorities for other categories in the Outdoor Recreation Account. Since much of the development on state lands involves trails and water access facilities, using those criteria as a guide along with priorities outlined in the state's comprehensive outdoor recreation plan, *An Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State: 2002-200* and the *State's Boating Facilities Plan*, the evaluation criteria in Attachment D were developed.

OTHER POLICIES THAT APPLY TO BOTH CATEGORIES

13. What type of evaluation process will be used to assess these projects?

It is recommended that we use a written evaluation process that does not require in-person presentations. Applicants will submit a project narrative that answers key questions and establishes performance measures for each proposal. The project narrative will address the following elements:

- **NEED:** Why is the project being undertaken?
- **OBJECTIVE:** What is to be accomplished during the period of the project pursuant to the stated need? Specify fully what is to be accomplished with the resources provided to implement the proposed project.
- **EXPECTED RESULTS AND BENEFITS:** How will the project impact the habitat, fish and wildlife resources, and provide public benefits? Provide quantifiable or verifiable resource benefits.
- **APPROACH:** How will the objective be attained? Include specific procedures, schedules, key cooperators and respective roles.
- **LOCATION:** Where will the work be done? For restoration or enhancement projects, describe the habitat type(s) to be affected, and relevant ecosystem/watershed characterization. For development or renovation projects, describe the recreation area and relevant land characteristics

Prior to the technical completion deadline, applicants will also submit responses to the evaluation criteria along with graphics that include maps and photos of the project site. These materials along with project summaries and cost estimates will be provided to the evaluation team.

14. Should there be minimum and maximum request limits for each project?

To more widely distribute funds available in the Restoration and Enhancement and Renovation and Development categories the following funds limits are recommended.

- The minimum WWRP share is \$25,000 per project.
- The maximum WWRP share is \$250,000 per project.

The minimum grant request was established to help ensure projects submitted meet the definition of a capital project. No matching share is required.

15. Are there key ineligible elements?

Yes, they include the following:

- Animal species introduction or propagation
- Fish or wildlife production facilities.
- Crop plantings
- Indoor facilities such as concessionaire buildings, environmental education learning centers, offices, residences, shops, etc.
- Projects required as part of a Habitat Conservation Plan approved by the federal government for incidental take of endangered or threatened species or other related habitat mitigation requirements.
- Routine operation and maintenance costs.
- Environmental cleanup of illegal activities (i.e. removal of derelict vessels, trash (dumping), meth labs, etc.).

16. Are multi-site projects allowed?

Agencies sometimes wish to submit a project that involves more than one work site. To assist agencies with efficient use of resources, a proposed multi-site policy was created. These conditions would apply to the eligibility of development, restoration, or enhancement projects that include more than a single location:

- All elements in development projects, across all sites, must be of the same type (for example, fishing docks, vault toilets, parking, etc.)
- All elements in restoration/enhancement projects must be for similar habitat improvements (for example, wetland restoration, shrub steppe, etc.; no combinations of significantly different habitats.)
- All elements must be in no more than two adjacent counties and/or within the same recreation area, natural area or wildlife area.
- All elements must meet the Office of Financial Management's capital project criteria, defined in the biennial publication Washington State Capital Plan Instructions.
- Funding for each site may total no more than \$50,000.
- No more than five sites may be included in any single project.

PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

These proposed policies are currently under review by the ad hoc advisors and other interested parties. An update on comments received will be provided at the Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends conditional adoption of Manual 10a, WWRP: Outdoor Recreation Account and conditional adoption of Manual 10b, WWRP: Habitat Conservation Account. These manuals contain the policies recommended for the State Lands

Development and Renovation (ORA) and the State Lands Restoration and Enhancement (HCA) categories.

Final adoption of Resolution #2006-04 is provided for Board consideration after the WWRP WAC rules are adopted (agenda item #11).

Attachments

- Draft Resolution 2006-04, Adoption of WWRP Manuals (See Agenda Item #11)
- Attachment A, Statutory Language from ESSB5396
- Attachment B, General Information from Previous IAC Board Memos
- Attachment C, Evaluation Criteria for State Lands Restoration and Enhancement
- Attachment D, Evaluation Criteria for State Lands Renovation and Development

RESOLUTION #2006-04
Adoption of Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Policy Manuals
Manual #10a, WWRP – Outdoor Recreation Account
Manual #10b, WWRP – Habitat Conservation Account

WHEREAS, Chapter 303, Laws of 2005 established State Lands Restoration and Enhancement and State Lands Development and Renovation as two new categories within the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) has the authority to adopt policies and rules for WWRP; and

WHEREAS, IAC staff has utilized the services of its ad hoc advisory committee composed of citizen representatives and state and local agency representatives to advise IAC on policies for these two new WWRP categories; and

WHEREAS, the proposed policy manuals, Manual #10a and Manual #10b, have been reviewed by the ad hoc advisory committee and the committee's recommendations transmitted to the IAC; and

WHEREAS, the proposed policies have been made available for review and comment by individuals and organizations that have expressed an interest in WWRP; and

WHEREAS, adoption of Manual #10a and Manual #10b is essential to implementing the first grant cycle for the State Lands Restoration and Enhancement and State Lands Development and Renovation categories, commencing May 1, 2006;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the IAC adopts *Manual #10a, WWRP - Outdoor Recreation Account* and *Manual 10b, WWRP - Habitat Conservation Account*; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that IAC staff is directed to take the necessary steps for immediate implementation and distribution of these manuals to interested parties.

Resolution moved by: _____

Resolution seconded by: _____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: February 2, 2006

Attachment A

Language from Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5396 (Ch. 303, Laws of 2005)

Habitat Restoration and Enhancement

Sec. 3. RCW 79A.15.040 and 1999 c 379 s 917 are each amended to read as follows:

- (1) Moneys appropriated for this chapter to the habitat conservation account shall be distributed in the following way:
 - (a) Not less than forty percent through June 30, 2011, at which time the amount shall become forty-five percent, for the, acquisition and development of critical habitat;
 - (b) Not less than thirty percent for the acquisition and development of natural areas;
 - (c) Not less than twenty percent for the acquisition and development of urban wildlife habitat; and
 - (d) Not less than ten percent through June 30, 2011, at which time the amount shall become five percent, shall be used by the committee to fund restoration and enhancement projects on state lands. Only the department of natural resources and the department of fish and wildlife may apply for these funds to be used on existing habitat and natural area lands.

Recreation Development and Renovation

Sec. 4. RCW 79A.15.050 and 2003 c 184 s 1 are each amended to read as follows:

- (1) Moneys appropriated for this chapter to the outdoor recreation account shall be distributed in the following way:
 - (a) Not less than thirty percent to the state parks and recreation commission for the acquisition and development of state parks, with at least fifty percent of the money for acquisition costs
 - (b) Not less than thirty percent for the acquisition, development, and renovation of local parks, with at least fifty percent of this money for acquisition costs;
 - (c) Not less than twenty percent for the acquisition, renovation, or development of trails;
 - (d) Not less than fifteen percent for the acquisition, renovation, or development of water access sites, with at least seventy-five percent of this money for acquisition costs; and
 - (e) Not less than five percent for development and renovation projects on state recreation lands. Only the department of natural resources and the department of fish and wildlife may apply for these funds to be used on their existing recreation lands.

Attachment B
General Information from the September 2005 Briefing Memorandum

State Lands Restoration and Enhancement

The Restoration and Enhancement category was established to provide funds for restoration and enhancement of “existing habitat and natural area lands.” The statute uses the term “lands,” but it is believed the intent is to focus on *habitats* whether they are terrestrial, marine, estuarine, or freshwater.

Who is eligible?

The Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources are the only applicants eligible to apply for these funds.

What types of projects are eligible?

Funds may be used for restoration and enhancement of existing habitats. It is clear from the statutory language that funds may not be used for acquisition of property interests, nor may applicants submit projects for restoration or enhancement of sites not already owned or managed by the applicant.

How much money is available for this category?

By statute, this category receives moneys appropriated to the Habitat Conservation Account. Specifically, through June 30, 2011, at least 10 percent of the moneys appropriated for the account are to be used by the Board to fund restoration and enhancement projects on state lands. After June 30, 2011, the amount is reduced to a minimum of five percent for this category.

What criteria are mentioned in the bill?

The bill does not mention any specific criteria that must be used to assess projects in this category; however, RCW 79A.15.060(6) does recommend criteria that the Board should consider when determining priorities for projects funded in the Habitat Conservation Account. In summary, these criteria are:

- Community support for the project
- Consistency with a local land use plan, or a regional or statewide recreation or resource plan, including projects that assist in the implementation of local shoreline master plans
- Diversity of species using the site
- Educational and scientific value of the site
- Enhancement of existing public property
- Immediacy of threat to the site
- Integration with recovery efforts for endangered, threatened, or sensitive species
- Long-term viability of the site
- Potential for public use
- Potential for use by special needs populations.
- Presence of endangered, threatened, or sensitive species

- Proposal's ongoing stewardship program that includes control of noxious weeds, detrimental invasive species, and that identifies the source of funds from which the stewardship program will be funded
- Proximity to other wildlife habitat
- Quality of the habitat
- Recommendations as part of a watershed plan or habitat conservation plan, or a coordinated region wide prioritization effort, and for projects primarily intended to benefit salmon, limiting factors, or critical pathways analysis.
- Uniqueness of the site

Recreation Development and Renovation

The Recreation Development and Renovation category was established to provide funds for renovation and development of "existing recreational lands."

Who is eligible?

Like the Habitat Restoration and Enhancement category, only the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources may submit applications for funding in this category.

What types of projects are eligible?

This category provides funds for development of new facilities and renovation of existing facilities. Typically recreational developments on lands managed by these agencies include:

- Boating facilities for motorized and non-motorized access
- Campsites
- Fishing access
- Hunting access
- Interpretive sites
- Picnic areas
- Scenic overlooks
- Trails and trailheads for motorized and non-motorized recreation, and
- Wildlife viewing areas.

Funds may only be used for improvements to properties already owned or managed by the applicants.

How much money is available for this category?

By statute, this category receives not less than five percent of the moneys appropriated to the Outdoor Recreation Account.

What criteria are mentioned in the bill?

The bill does not mention any specific criteria that must be used to assess projects in this category. RCW 79A.15.070 (6) directs the Board to consider specific criteria for trails and water access sites. Since much of the development on state lands involves trails and water access facilities, the Board may want to consider some of the criteria outlined as priorities for these two categories in the Outdoor Recreation Account.

These include:

- Community support for the project
- Consistency with a local land use plan, or a regional or statewide recreational or resource plan, including projects that assist in the implementation of local shoreline master plans
- Distance from similar water access opportunities
- Diversity of possible recreational uses
- Enhancement of wildlife habitat
- Existing or potential use
- Immediacy of threat to the site
- Linkage between communities
- Linkage between trails
- Long-term viability of the site
- Public demand in the area
- Scenic values of the site

Consideration of priorities outlined in the state's comprehensive outdoor recreation plan, *An Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State: 2002-2006* and the State's Boating Facilities Plan, may also be appropriate.

Policy Issues

Policy issues requiring Board consideration. Questions for consideration include:

- How do we define enhancement?
- How do we define restoration?
- How do we define renovation versus deferred maintenance?
- Which lands are classified as recreational lands?
- May funds in the recreation category be used for development of facilities on habitat lands?
- Could funds be used for projects solely focused on eradication of invasive species?
- How should funds be distributed? Should there be a guaranteed amount for each agency?
- Should ranked lists of projects be submitted to the Governor and Legislature?
- Should there be minimum and maximum request limits for each project?
- Should preference be given to projects on sites previously funded by IAC?
- Should we allow use of stewardship or management plans to satisfy the planning eligibility requirement?
- Should we fund projects on lands that are leased? If yes, should there be a minimum number of years remaining on the lease?
- What are key criteria to consider when evaluating these projects?
- What should be the make-up of the evaluation team(s)?
- What type of project selection process is appropriate?

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program

Evaluation Criteria

State Lands Restoration and Enhancement Category

(WA Department of Fish and Wildlife & WA Department of Natural Resources)

“Restoration means bringing a site back to its original function through activities that can be reasonably expected to result in a site that is self sustaining; that is, the site will not require continual intervention to function as a predominately natural ecosystem. Enhancement improves the functionality of a site.”

RCW 79A.15.010

WWRP – State Lands Restoration and Enhancement Evaluation Criteria Summary			
Criteria Number	Criteria	Evaluation Elements	Possible Points
1	Ecological and Biological Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bigger picture • Uniqueness/significance of the site • Quality of habitat 	15
2	Need for Restoration or Enhancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrated need for restoration/enhancement 	15
3	Long-Term Manageability and Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat to the site • Long-term viability • Enhancement of existing protected land 	10
4	Species and Communities with Special Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat to species/communities • Importance of restoration/enhancement • Ecological roles • Rarity 	5
5	Plan Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans • Prioritization efforts 	5
6	Public Benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurable benefits • Educational and/or scientific value • Community support 	5
Total Points Possible			55

WWRP Scoring Criteria

State Lands Restoration and Enhancement Category

1. ECOLOGICAL /BIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS. Why is the site worthy of long-term conservation?

The Bigger Picture. “Paint a picture” of your project for the evaluators - the what, where, and why. This is the “heart” of your presentation and evaluators will draw conclusions based on the information presented about the *quality and function of the habitat* and the *demonstrated need to protect, restore or enhance* it.

- What specific role does this project play in a broader watershed or landscape picture?
- Is this site part of a larger ownership? If so, describe the connectivity and management of the larger habitat area.
- What are the primary habitat functions?
- Does the project have functional connectivity with existing habitats?

Uniqueness/Significance. Explain how the site is unique or significant on a regional, ecosystem, watershed, and/or urban growth area level.

- What habitat types exist on site?
- How unique is the site in relation to habitat quality, connectivity, diversity, and rarity?
- How is the site important in providing critical habitat or biological function for wildlife species/communities?
- How does this site compare to others of the same type?

Quality Of Habitat. Describe the ecological and biological quality of the habitat.

- What specific role does the habitat play in supporting the species/communities using the site?
- How is this habitat important in providing food, water, cover, connectivity, and resting areas for wildlife?
- What natural features make this site a priority for restoration/enhancement efforts?
- Are the size, quality, and other characteristics of the habitat adequate to support the target species/communities within the context of the project area?

Point Range: 0-5
Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3

2. NEED FOR RESTORATION/ENHANCEMENT. What is the need for stewardship activities, whether restoration or enhancement? Establish need by identifying comparable opportunities (quality and quantity). Describe the quality and function of the habitat and the demonstrated need and plans to restore or enhance it.

- Is the site located in an ecologically critical area?
- Is the habitat recoverable?
- What is the restoration plan?
- Does this project enhance other restoration efforts with the same/similar goals?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3

3. LONG-TERM MANAGEABILITY AND VIABILITY. Will the project result in restoring or enhancing land that function in a manner that is sustainable and integrates appropriately with bordering communities or habitats? What is the likelihood of the site remaining viable over the long term and why is it important to restore or enhance it now?

Threats to the Habitat. What, and how imminent, are the threats (i.e., inherent, ecological, human, abatable and/or non-abatable threats) to the habitat at this site?

- Are these new threats or ongoing threats?
- How do or will these threats affect the function of the habitat?
- How will restoration/enhancement of the site affect these threats?
- What steps are you taking to reduce the threats?

Long-Term Viability. Describe how the site will be managed over time to maintain the desired characteristics.

- What is happening across the landscape or watershed that may affect the viability of the site?
- What are the long-term stewardship plans and the anticipated outcome? Describe any long-term site monitoring plans and identify who will implement monitoring?
- What human and financial resources are available to maintain the site? How will noxious weeds and invasive species be controlled?
- What regulatory protections are currently afforded to the site (i.e., Critical Areas Ordinances, zoning, development regulation, Shoreline Management rules, Forest Practice rules, etc.)?

Enhancement of Existing Protected Land. Describe the other protected lands (public and private) near or adjoining this site that have complimentary or compatible land uses or habitats.

- Are they managed and monitored in a manner that is consistent with the stewardship plans for the project area?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2

4. SPECIES AND/OR COMMUNITIES WITH SPECIAL STATUS. What are the habitat communities or species of wildlife that will benefit most from the improvements proposed for this site?

This question's intent is to determine the significance of the species or communities with special status and how they may benefit from your project. Some special status species or communities may benefit on a more passive basis, while others may benefit directly.

Threat to the Species or Communities. Describe the threat to the species/community (e.g., imminent danger of extinction (range-wide); in imminent danger of extirpation (population); threatened within the foreseeable future, or concern because of current trends; population stable, but catastrophic event could threaten; no foreseeable threat).

Importance of Restoration/Enhancement for the Species/Community Protection or Recovery. Describe the relative importance of this habitat restoration or enhancement effort when compared to other protection /recovery tasks. Describe the distribution or range and, if known, the abundance of the species or community. Identify any recovery plans, conservation strategies or similar plans that include reference to this site.

Ecological Roles. What role does the target species play in the ecosystem in which it lives? Do other species depend on it for their survival? Will its loss substantially alter the functioning of the ecosystem?

Rarity. Describe the distribution or range and, if known, the abundance of the species or community

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1

5. PLAN PRIORITY. How is this project supported by a current plan (i.e. watershed, stewardship, state/regional resource, species management, shoreline, salmon recovery, open space, land use, habitat conservation, agency) or a coordinated prioritization effort? Describe the plan or prioritization efforts.

- What is the status of the plan(s)?
- How does this proposal help meet the goals and/or strategy of the plan?
- How important is this project in comparison to other potential projects?
- What process was used to identify this project as a priority?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1

6. PUBLIC BENEFIT. To what extent does this project result in measurable benefits for the species or community impacted as a result of this restoration or enhancement?

This question's intent is to find out what *unique* benefits your project provides to maintaining an ecologically diverse ecosystem and how are those benefits measured so you know you have been successful. This question is not meant to discount projects for *not* having overwhelming community support or educational opportunities. It may be that your project has qualities that provide a unique opportunity for the community to benefit from its implementation. Your answer will be scored on those unique qualities and how they are appropriate for, or are of benefit to, your project.

Measurable Benefits. The response should describe what ecosystem functions will be restored and how well will the proposed habitat actions address the restoration or enhancement needs identified.

Educational and Scientific Value. Describe the scientific and educational values of the site.

- Is there an identified research or educational need documented in a management plan, thesis, or scientific journal related to the habitat, species, or communities at the site?
- How likely is it that these opportunities will come to fruition?
- How accessible is the site for these activities?

Community Support. Describe the support or partnerships you have from the community, interest groups, volunteers, public agencies, etc.

- To what degree do communities, governments, landowners, constituent groups, or academia benefit from or support the project?
- How have you involved these groups in project development? Explain any known opposition to the project.
- Describe and document any monetary means that have been secured to help continue stewardship of the habitat area (i.e., endowments, grants, donations, public/private management agreements, etc.)

Point Range: 0-5
Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1

Instructions: Species and Communities with Special Status Table

Species and Communities With Special Status Table. Complete and submit the table on page 7. This is a required part of the application. Staff will verify the information and evaluators will be given a copy of the table along with the other project materials. This table relates directly to Evaluation Question #2, Species and Communities with Special Status, with emphasis on the significance of the species. As part of the presentation, applicants must describe the significance information to evaluators for scoring.

Species, Community or Habitat Type. List each species, community, or habitat type with special status present in your project area or work site.

Occurrence. For special status animal species, indicate whether the occurrence of the species at the site is *breeding, feeding, migration, resting, perching, roosting, wintering, rearing, spawning, year-round resident, individual occurrence, or unknown*. For special status plant species, communities or habitat types, enter "N/A" in the occurrence column.

Status and Source. Indicate the status of the species and the source from which you obtained the information. Federal and state status and source information follows:

Federally Listed Species:

- Resident fish and wildlife—Endangered Species Office, Lacey (360) 753-9440
- Pacific salmon species—National Marine Fisheries Service; www.noaa.gov/

State Listed Species and Candidate Species:

- Endangered Species Section, WDFW, (360) 902-2515; www.wa.gov/wdfw/wildlife.htm

Priority Habitats and Species:

- Priority Habitat and Species Program, WDFW, (360) 902-2543; www.wa.gov/wdfw/habitat.htm

State Listed Plant Species and Communities:

- Natural Heritage Program, DNR (360) 902-1667; www.wa.gov/dnr/

IAC will provide data request forms for both state databases. If your information came from a source other than these (such as a consultant or local biologist), please indicate on your form.

Federal Status		State Status	
FE	Endangered	SE	State endangered
FT	Threatened	ST	State threatened
FP	Proposed for threatened or endangered	SS	State sensitive
FC	Candidate for listing status review	SC	Candidate for listing status review
FSC	Species of concern	PS	Priority Species, non-listed but vulnerable
		PH	Priority Habitat
		P1, P2, P3	Priority 1, Priority 2, and Priority 3 (plants)

Example Matrix:

Species, Community or Habitat Type	Occurrence	Status	Source
Douglas Fir/ Western Hemlock/ Swordfern Community	N/A	P 2	DNR – WNHP
Brown Pelican	foraging, resting	FE, SE	WDFW – PHS
Thompson's Clover	N/A	P 2	DNR – WNHP
Chinook Salmon	rearing	FE	NMFS; SSHIAP *
Western Pond Turtle	year-round resid't	FSC, SE	USFWS; Consultant
Riparian Area	N/A	PH	WDFW – PHS

* SSHIAP Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program (NW Indian Fisheries Commission /WDFW)

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program
Evaluation Criteria

State Lands Development and Renovation Category

This project category is reserved for the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Natural Resources for development and/or renovation of state recreation lands.

IAC Manual 10.

WWRP - State Lands Development and Renovation Criteria Analysis					
Score	#	Title	Type	Points	Focus
Team	1	Public Need	D	15	State
Team	2	Site Suitability and Design	D	15	Technical
Team	3	Diversity and Compatibility	D	10	State
Team	4	Plan Priority	D	5	State
Team	5	Performance Measure	D	5	State
Team	6	Public Benefit	D	5	State
IAC Score	7	Population Proximity	D	1	State
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE = 56					

KEY:

- IAC Score = Criteria scored by IAC staff
- Team = Criteria scored by interdisciplinary team
- D = Development and Renovation specific question
- Multi/Mx = Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
- Focus = *St/Loc/Tech*; Criteria orientation in accordance with SCORP policy of developing evaluation systems based on three need factors: those that meet general *statewide* needs (often called for in RCW or SCORP), those that meet *local* needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans), and those that meet *technical* considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

WWRP SCORING CRITERIA

State Lands Development and Renovation

Team Scored

1. **PUBLIC NEED. Considering the availability of existing facilities within the service area, what is the need for new or improved facilities?**

Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007, Chapter 5.

Establish the recreation need by inventorying all available outdoor recreation opportunities (quality/quantity) within the service area. In general, areas with fewer outdoor recreation sites will score higher than those with more. Other considerations:

- ▷ Existing capacity: Are nearby sites used to capacity?
- ▷ Are there unserved or under served user groups?
- ▷ Is there a threat to the public availability of the resources the site possesses?
- ▷ Demonstrated need for development/renovation
- ▷ How well will this project satisfy the needs identified?
- ▷ What is the expected or potential use upon completion of this project?
- ▷ Describe existing conditions and explain how this project will improve the visitor experience.

Point Range:

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

2. **SITE SUITABILITY AND PROJECT DESIGN. Does the project demonstrate good design criteria; does it make the best use of the site?**

Measure the quality of the functional and aesthetic aspects of the site design as related to the site and the proposed uses.

- ▷ Will site resources be appropriately made available for public use or recreation?
- ▷ Will natural, environmental, or other important values be protected by the proposed development?

Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses.

Some design elements that may be considered include:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| ▪ Accuracy of Cost Estimates | ▪ Recreation Experiences |
| ▪ Aesthetics | ▪ Readiness to proceed |
| ▪ Environmentally Friendly Design | ▪ Risk Management |
| ▪ Innovation and Sustainability | ▪ Site suitability |
| ▪ Maintenance | ▪ Space Relationships |
| ▪ Materials | ▪ Suitability of the Proposed Improvements |
| ▪ Phasing | ▪ User Friendly/Barrier Free |

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

3. **DIVERSITY OF AND COMPATIBILITY OF RECREATIONAL/ENVIRONMENTAL/OTHER RESOURCES/USES. To what extent does this project provide diversity of possible recreational resource experiences or activities?**

Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007, Chapters 1 and 5.

Sites can provide the opportunity for a variety of recreational/preservation uses. In general, projects providing more *compatible* recreation/preservation uses will score better than projects providing just one type of opportunity.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

4. **PLAN PRIORITY. How is this project supported by a current plan (i.e. local, state/regional resource, shoreline, open space, land use, outdoor recreation, agency) or a coordinated prioritization effort?**

- ▷ Describe the plan or prioritization efforts.
- ▷ What is the status of the plan(s)?
- ▷ How does this proposal help meet the goals and/or strategy of the plan?
- ▷ How important is this project in comparison to other potential projects?
- ▷ What process was used to identify this project as a priority?
- ▷ The extent that the project is of statewide/regional/local significance.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

5. **OUTCOME-FOCUSED PERFORMANCE MEASURES. To what extent does the project result in measurable progress toward goals and objectives for the recreation or access area?**

A grant award should be considered an investment with a measurable, positive return to the public in the long run. This question's intent is to find out what unique benefits your project provides and how are those benefits are measured so you know you have been successful. In general, applicants who provide evidence or documentation of the goals and objectives associated with the project site and describe how the project results in measurable progress toward those goals should score higher.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

6. **PUBLIC BENEFIT AND PROJECT SUPPORT. To what extent does this project result in measurable benefits for the community impacted as a result of this development or renovation?**

Benefit is the gain realized with the requested level of public investment: it can be a gain for the environment, gain for the general public or other gain. Proposals demonstrating great net benefits should score higher than proposal with limited value, or with value at too great a cost. Cost can be unacceptable harm to the environment or something that causes unnecessary ill will.

Broadly interpret the term *project support* to include, but not be limited to:

- ▷ Extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
- ▷ To what degree do communities, governments, landowners, constituent groups, or academia benefit from or support the project?
- ▷ How have you involved these groups in project development?
- ▷ Is there known opposition? Explain.
- ▷ Describe and document any monetary means that have been secured to help with implementation of the project (i.e., endowments, grants, donations, public/private management agreements, etc.)
- ▷ Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user/"friends" groups
- ▷ Describe the support or partnerships you have from the community, interest groups, volunteers, public agencies, etc.

Point Range: 0-5

IAC staff awards a maximum of 1 point that is later multiplied by 1.

IAC Staff Scores

7. **PROXIMITY TO HUMAN POPULATIONS. Is the project located in a populated area?**
RCW 79A.25.250 (IAC urban area parks)

IAC policy is to give funding preference to projects located in populated areas. Populated areas are defined (RCW 43.52.380) as a town or city with a population of 5,000 or more, or a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Is the project in an area meeting this definition?

Point Range: 0-5

IAC staff awards a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Outdoor Recreation Account

Instructions to Evaluators:

Score All. To ensure statistical parity among projects, each evaluator will score *all* proposals. While interpretation of team-scored criteria is at the discretion of individual evaluators, the guidelines in each instrument should be used.

Consistency. Individual team members may consider different aspects of projects important. Some evaluators may give high scores all the way through, while others may give lower scores. It is most important, however, that each evaluator score all projects in a consistent manner throughout the rating process.

Judge the Evidence. Final scores will depend on an evaluator's personal appraisal of, and confidence in, the information presented. Weak or unsubstantiated claims will be scored accordingly.

Voice Opinions. Evaluators are expected to discuss each proposal with other team members and presenters. Active participation and critical thinking is important. Comments on strengths, weaknesses and the number of evaluation points that should be awarded are all encouraged. Comments, however, must remain pertinent to the current project.

Two forms are supplied to assist evaluators:

1. WWRP SCORING CRITERIA pages will not be collected from team members. These guidelines are for use during the presentations. Evaluators should consult them for project scoring advice.
2. PROJECT SCORE SUMMARY pages that evaluators will use to record all scores. Evaluators will award *whole number* scores for each criterion. No fractions, please. These pages will be collected at the end of this category and at the end of each day. This procedure is designed to allow team members time to check consistency by reviewing individual scores awarded in each category.

After collecting the Score Summary sheets, *IAC staff will* factor in multipliers, total all scores, and list projects in final rank order.