

Natural Resources Building
1111 Washington St SE
Olympia WA 98501
PO Box 40917
Olympia WA 98504-0917



(360) 902-3000
TTY (360) 902-1996
Fax: (360) 902-3026
E-mail: info@rcow.wa.gov
Web site: www.rcow.wa.gov

STATE OF WASHINGTON

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE

January 2, 2008

**Topic #7: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria and Process**

Prepared By: Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Habitat Section Manager
Bill Koss, Planner, Washington State Parks and Recreation

Presented By: Marguerite Austin and Washington State Parks Staff

Approved by the Director:

Proposed Action: Briefing

Summary

Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) staff requests Board review of a proposal submitted by Washington State Parks and Recreation for evaluation of projects submitted to the State Parks category of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program. The proposal outlined in Attachment A was prepared by State Parks in anticipation of State Parks Commission adoption in January and submittal to the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board for consideration and adoption in March for the 2008 grant cycle.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends Board review and comment on the proposal. With direction from the Board, State Parks and RCO staff will proceed with public review of the proposed criteria and process.

Background

The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board approves policies that govern the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP), which was established by the Washington State Legislature in 1990. The State Parks category in the Outdoor Recreation Account is open to the State Parks and Recreation Commission only. At the November 2007 board meeting, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board adopted Resolution 2007-30, *Evaluation Process for the State Parks Category*, which delegates to the Washington State Parks Commission evaluation and ranking of



Commission projects, which are to be submitted to the Board for funding following Board approval of the evaluation process and criteria used. This revision was approved by the Board for the following reasons:

- ▶ The Commission is the sole eligible applicant for the category.
- ▶ The WWRP statute does not include specific criteria for assessing projects in the category.
- ▶ It reduces the demands on staff resources and avoids duplication of evaluation processes.
- ▶ It avoids the awkwardness of asking a volunteer panel to rank projects only to have the list reordered by the Commission.
- ▶ It places greater emphasis on priorities established by the commission through its planning and prioritization process.

State Parks staff has drafted proposed criteria and process to be used for these projects (see Attachment A, *WWRP-State Parks Category Project Evaluation*). This proposal will be submitted to the State Parks Commission for consideration at their January 18, 2008 meeting.

Next Steps

Pending adoption by the Commission, Recreation and Conservation Office staff will review the proposal and prepare a staff recommendation for review and comment by members of the public. After receiving public comment, a final recommendation will be prepared for consideration by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board at the March 27-28 meeting.

Attachment

Attachment A, Washington State Parks Evaluation Criteria and Process for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program State Parks Category

DRAFT

WWRP-STATE PARKS CATEGORY PROJECT EVALUATION

January 2, 2008

Public Visibility Steps

1. State Parks and Recreation Commission review list of candidate projects at April work session (open to public, no public comment taken)
2. Report draft ranked list to Commission at June Commission Meeting (open to public, public comment taken)
3. Request Commission approval of final ranked list at August Commission Meeting (open to public, public comment taken)

Administrative Steps

1. RCO review and comment on project eligibility prior to evaluation.
2. Top priority, i.e. 'high priority' projects identified prior to evaluation meeting.
3. PowerPoint presentation to Evaluation Team (PDSC AD, Capital Program Manager, Planning Program Manager, Stewardship Program Manager, 2 Region Managers, 2 Capital Program Region Managers, Programs Manager) who score all projects. RCO staff observes.
4. Evaluation Team develops ranked list based scoring using predetermined criteria and funding 'high priority' projects.

<u>Proposed Criteria</u>	<u>Total Points*</u>
Public Need	5
Project Significance	15
Project Design (development only)	5
Immediacy of Threat (acquisition only)	5
Expansion/Phased Project	10
Multiple Funding Sources	5
Readiness to Proceed	5
Shows Application of Sustainability	5

* All criteria scored 0-5 then multiplied by 1, 2, or 3 to get to total points

Total Points for Acquisition = 50

Total Points for Development = 50

Public Need = describe why this facility should be built or property acquired, e.g. cited in CAMP, cited in 10 Year Capital Plan, consistent with Centennial 2013 Vision, identified by public, etc.

Project Significance = why this is a project of statewide or regional merit, is this a 'high priority' project?

Project Design (development only) = describe how this project demonstrates good site and building design

Immediacy of Threat (acquisition only) = describe the consequences of not obtaining this land now

Expansion/Phased Project = is this a continuation of a previous project? When did the previous project start/end?

Multiple Funding Sources = are there multiple funding sources proposed to support this project

Readiness to Proceed = is the project fully designed and permitted (development) or is there a written sales agreement with the property owner (acquisition)? Any significant local zoning or permitting issues?

Shows Application of Sustainability = does the proposed design or acquisition meet accepted sustainability standards and/or Best Management Practices and/or stewardship of natural or cultural resources?

=====

<u>Previous Criteria</u>	<u>Points</u>
Public Need	10
Project Significance	5
Project Design (development only)	10
Immediacy of Threat (acquisition only)	10
Site Suitability	15
Expansion/Phased Project	5
Diversity of Recreation	10
Project Support	10
Cost Efficiencies	5
Population Proximity	5
TOTAL	75