

**Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program – State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria Changes  
Adopted by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board**

**April , 28 2016 (Item 16)**

**Resolution #2016-20**

At its April 28<sup>th</sup> 2016 RCFB meeting, the board made the changes to the following 2014 State Parks category evaluation questions.

- Question #1 Public Need
- Question #5 Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship
- Question #6 Expansion/Phased Project
- Question #8 Readiness to Proceed
- Question #9 Consistency with Mission and Vision

And added the following question:

- Question #7 Project Support.

The below evaluation summary and questions represent the complete updated evaluation criteria.

## State Parks Category

This project category is reserved for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission for acquisition and/or development of state parks.

State Parks Criteria Summary					
Score	#	Question	Project Type	Maximum Points Possible	Focus*
Advisory Committee	1	Public Need and Need Satisfaction	All	5	State
Advisory Committee	2	Project Significance	All	15	Agency
Advisory Committee	3	Threat and Impact	Acquisition	10	State
			Combination	5	
Advisory Committee	4	Project Design	Development	10	Technical
			Combination	5	
Advisory Committee	5	Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship	All	10	State
Advisory Committee	6	Expansion/Phased Project	All	15	State

State Parks Criteria Summary					
Advisory Committee	7	Project Support	All	10	Agency
Advisory Committee	8	Partnership or Match	All	5	State
Advisory Committee	9	Readiness to Proceed	All	10	Agency
State Parks Commission	10	Commission Priorities	All	6	Agency
RCO Staff	11	Proximity to Human Populations	All	3	State
<b>Total Points Possible = 89</b>					

\*Focus—Criteria orientation in accordance with the following priorities:

- State—those that meet general statewide needs (often called for in Revised Codes of Washington or the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP))
- Agency—those that meet agency needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in the State Parks and Recreation Commission’s plans)
- Technical—those that meet technical considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

## Detailed Scoring Criteria: State Parks Category

### *Evaluation Team Scored*

1. **Public Need and Need Satisfaction.** What is the need for the proposed project? To what extent will the project satisfy the need? Consider the following:
  - Cited in a Classification and Management Plan (CAMP), if one exists?
  - Identified in a park master plan or other approved planning document?
  - Included in the current State Parks’ 10-year capital plan?
  - Consistent with State Parks’ strategic plan?
  - Project or property is suited to serve the stated need?
  - To what degree will the project:
    - Further care for Washington's most treasured lands, waters, and historic places.
    - Connect more Washingtonians to their diverse natural and cultural heritage.
    - Improve quality or expand capacity for recreational and educational experiences.

▲ Point Range

- 0 points: No CAMP or other plan, indirectly implements State Parks' mission and vision
- 1-2 points: Implements mission and vision despite a CAMP. Adequately addresses stated need.
- 3-4 points: Implements mission and vision. Consistent with CAMP or other plan, resolves a management problem, essential to a partnership, or will increase park visitation. Greatly addresses stated need.
- 5 points: Strongly implements mission and vision. High priority in a CAMP or other plan, resolves a management problem, essential to a partnership, or will increase park visitation. Maximizes the satisfaction of the stated need.

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points.

Adopted April 2016.

2. **Project Significance.** Describe how this project supports State Parks' strategic goals. Does it:

- Serve underserved visitors or communities?
- Protect or restore natural or cultural resources?
- Have a demonstrated ability to save money or increase park net revenue?
- Provide recreational, cultural, or interpretive opportunities people want?
- Promote meaningful opportunities for volunteers, friends, and partners?
- Facilitate a meaningful partnership with other agencies, tribes, or non-profits?

▲ Point Range

- 0 points Does not directly support strategic goals
- 1-2 points Indirectly supports one or two strategic goals
- 3-5 points Directly supports at least one strategic goal or indirectly supports three or more strategic goals

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

3. **Threat and Impacts** (acquisition and combination projects only). Describe why it is important to acquire the property now. Consider:
- Is there an immediate threat to the property that will result in a loss in quality or availability of future public use?
  - Will the acquisition result in additional operating impacts, and if so, is there potential for those impacts to be offset by additional revenue?

▲ Point Range

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| 0 points   | No evidence of threat to the property, and/or the acquisition will result in unreasonable operating impacts   |
| 1-2 points | Minimal threat to the property, or the acquisition will result in moderate operating impacts  |
| 3-5 points | Imminent threat of the property losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use, or a threat led to a land trust acquiring rights in the land at the request of State Parks, and operating impacts will be minimal or offset by additional revenue |

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points. Scores for acquisition projects are multiplied later by 2.

4. **Project Design** (development and combination projects only). Is the project well designed? Consider the following:
- Does this property support the type of development proposed? Describe the attributes: size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, location and access, utility service, wetlands, etc.
  - How does the project design make the best use of the site?
  - How well does the design provide equal access for all people, including those with disabilities? How does this project exceed current barrier-free requirements?
  - Does the nature and condition of existing or planned land use in the surrounding area support the type of development proposed?
  - How does the design conform to current permitting requirements, building codes, safety standards, best management practices, etc.? What, if any, are the mitigation requirements for this project?

- Does the design align with the described need?
- Are the access routes (paths, walkways, sidewalks) designed appropriately (width, surfacing) for the use and do they provide connectivity to all site elements?
- For trails, does the design provide adequate separation from roadways, surfacing, width, spatial relationships, grades, curves, switchbacks, road crossings, and trailhead locations?
- Is the cost estimate realistic?

#### ▲ Point Range

0 points	Design is not appropriate for the site or the intended use
1-2 points	Design is moderately appropriate for the site and the intended use
3-4 points	Design is very appropriate for the site and the intended use, it addresses most elements of the question, and cost estimates are accurate and complete
5 points	Design addresses all elements of the question very well, and cost estimates are accurate and complete

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points. Scores for acquisition projects are multiplied later by 2.

5. **Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship.** What techniques or resources are proposed to ensure the project will result in a quality, sustainable, recreational, heritage preservation, or educational opportunity, while protecting the integrity of the environment? Describe how the project will protect natural and cultural resources and integrate sustainable elements such as low impact development techniques, green infrastructure, or environmentally preferred building products.

0 points:	No or little stewardship elements.
1-2 points:	Contains stewardship elements and protects natural or cultural resources. Consistent with State Parks' Sustainability Plan and goals.
3-4 points:	Numerous stewardship elements, protects and enhances natural resources or cultural resources. Implements many of State Parks' sustainability goals.
5 points:	Maximizes natural or cultural resource protection, enhances natural resources or cultural resources, and contains innovative and outstanding stewardship elements. Implements many of State Parks' sustainability goals.

- ▲ Point Range: Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

Adopted April 2016.

6. **Expansion/Phased Project.** Does this project implement an important phase of a previous project, represent an important first phase, or expand or improve an existing site? Consider:

- Is the project part of a phased acquisition or development?
- To what extent will this project advance completion of a plan or vision?
- Is this project an important first phase?
- What is the value of this phase?
- How does the project complement an existing site or expand usage, preservation, or education within a site?

- ▲ Point Range

0 points: Neither a significant phase or expansion nor a distinct stand-alone project.

1-2 points: Project is a quality or important phase or expansion.

3-4 points: Project is a key first phase or expansion or moves a project significantly towards realizing a vision.

5 points: Project is highly important first phase, final (or near final) phase, moves a project a great deal towards realizing a vision.

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

Adopted April 2016.

7. **Project Support.** What is the extent to which the public (statewide, community, or user groups) has been provided with an adequate opportunity to become informed of the project, or support for the project seems apparent.

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.
- The extent that there is project support, including:

- Voter-approved initiative
- Public participation and feedback.
- Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user and friends groups.
- Positive media coverage.

▲ Point Range

- 0 points: No evidence presented.
- 1-2 points: Marginal community support. Opportunities for only minimal public involvement (i.e. a single adoption hearing), or little evidence that the public supports the project.
- 3 points: Adequate support and opportunity presented for participation.
- 4-5 points: The public has received ample and varied opportunities to provide meaningful input into the project and there is overwhelming support. The public was so supportive from the project's inception that an extensive public participation process was not necessary.

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

Adopted April 2016.

8. **Partnerships or Match.** Describe how this project supports strategic partnerships or leverages matching funds. Consider:
- Does the project help form strategic partnerships with other agencies, tribes, or nonprofits? (A strategic partnership is one that ultimately is expected to offset expenses, leverage investments, or stimulate activity that directly or indirectly generates a financial return.)
  - Does the partnership facilitate a key State Parks' goal or objective?
  - Does the project have a match of cash, grants, or in-kind services?

▲ Point Range

- 0 points No partners or match
- 1-2 points One partner or up to 10 percent match
- 3-4 points Two partners or 10.01-24.99 percent match

5 points      Three or more partners or 25 percent or more match

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points.

9. **Readiness to Proceed.** Describe the project's timeline. Is the project ready to proceed? Consider:

- For development projects, is it fully designed and permitted?
- For acquisition projects, is there written documentation indicating a willing seller?
- For acquisition projects, is there a written sales agreement or option with the property owner?
- Are there any significant zoning, permitting issues, or encumbrances?
- Has State Parks completed an economic impact analysis or business plan for the project that identifies operational impacts and potential for revenue enhancement?

▲ Point Range

0 points:      Not ready, business case not evident.

(Acquisition) No agreement with landowner and fiscal impact will be substantial.

(Development) No construction drawings, no formal (or negative) business case determined, and fiscal impact will be substantial.

1-2 points: (Acquisition) Willing seller identified, economic impact analysis completed or positive cost-benefit determined.

(Development) Construction drawings at or near 60 percent complete. Economic impact analysis identifies minimal operating impacts. Positive cost-benefit analysis exists.

3-4 points: (Acquisition) Property (purchase) secured in some way by legal instrument to include a letter of intent, or being held in trust or by a nongovernmental organization (for example). Positive cost-benefit analysis exists.

(Development) Construction drawings at or more than 60 percent complete, and economic analysis identifies potential revenue from the project or positive cost-benefit analysis exists.

5 points: (Acquisition) Parks has a "Purchase and Sale Agreement or Option" signed and the purchase will be made within its existing term, has very strong business case, and cost-benefit analysis exists.

(Development) Plans completed and all permits in hand, economic analysis identifies potential revenue from the project. Positive cost-benefit analysis exists. Completed business plan identifies potential revenue from the project.

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

Adopted April 2016.

*Scored by Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission—Applicants do not answer.*

10. **Commission's Priority.** How well does this project implement the commission's priorities?

The Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission evaluates this criterion.

The Commission provides RCO with a ranked list of their applications.

RCO assigns a point value to each project based on its rank. The highest priority project shall receive a point score equal to the number of applications ranked. The second highest ranked project shall receive a point score 1 less than the one above it, and so on. The lowest priority application shall receive a value of 1.

RCO will apply a variable multiplier to the scores so the highest ranked application will receive a point value of 6, and all other applications will have a point value less than 6 and proportional to their rank.

▲ Point Range (after multiplier): 0-6.

Adopted April 2016.

Example (assumes 13 projects evaluated):

Application/ Project	Commission's Rank	RCO Assinged Point Value	Multiplier (6/13)	Final Point Value
A	1	13	0.462	6.00
B	2	12	0.462	5.54
C	3	11	0.462	5.08
D	4	10	0.462	4.62
E	5	9	0.462	4.15
F	6	8	0.462	3.69
G	7	7	0.462	3.23
H	8	6	0.462	2.77
I	9	5	0.462	2.31
J	10	4	0.462	1.85
K	11	3	0.462	1.38
L	12	2	0.462	0.92
M	13	1	0.462	0.46
Total Applications = 13				

*Scored by RCO Staff—Applicants do not answer.*

11. **Proximity to Human Populations.** Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities and town, and county density?

This question is scored by RCO staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive a score, the map must show the project location and project boundary in relationship to a city's or town's urban growth boundary.

▲ Point Range

- A. The project is within the urban growth area boundary of a city or town with a population of 5,000 or more.

Yes 1.5 points

No 0 points

AND

- B. The project is within a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Yes 1.5 points

No 0 points

The result from A is added to the result from B. Projects in cities with a population of more than 5,000 *and* within high density counties receive points from both A and B. RCO staff awards a maximum of 3 points.