

## Proposed Agenda Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Regular Meeting

June 24-25, 2010

William A. Grant Water & Environmental Center, Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, Washington  
*Olympia Conference Call Location (Friday, June 25): Natural Resources Building, Room 259, Olympia, WA*

---

**Time:** Opening sessions will begin as shown; all other times are approximate.

### Order of Presentation:

In general, each agenda item will include a presentation, followed by board discussion and then public comment. The board makes decisions following the public comment portion of the agenda item.

### Public Comment:

If you wish to comment at a meeting, please fill out a comment card and provide it to staff. Please be sure to note on the card if you are speaking about a particular agenda topic. The chair will call you to the front at the appropriate time.

You also may submit written comments to the Board by mailing them to the RCO, attn: Rebecca Connolly, Board Liaison at the address above or at [rebecca.connolly@rco.wa.gov](mailto:rebecca.connolly@rco.wa.gov).

### Special Accommodations:

If you need special accommodations to participate in this meeting, please notify us by June 17, 2010 at 360/902-3013 or TDD 360/902-1996.

---

## THURSDAY, JUNE 24

---

- 10:00 a.m. Tour of RCFB-Funded Projects in Tri-Cities Area** *Not part of the official meeting.*
- Kennewick, Clover Island
  - Richland, Howard Amon Park
  - Kennewick, Columbia Park
- 12:30 p.m. End Tour** -- Lunch on own, travel to Walla Walla Community College
- 3:30 p.m. Open Public Meeting: Joint Session with the State Parks Commission**  
**Topic: Investing Sustainably and Sustaining Our Investments**  
Walla Walla Community College, William A. Grant Water & Environmental Center
- 5:00 p.m. Adjourn for the Day**

---

## FRIDAY, JUNE 25

---

### OPENING AND MANAGEMENT REPORTS

- 8:30 a.m. Call to Order** *Board Chair*
- Roll Call and Determination of Quorum
  - Review and Approval of Agenda – June 24-25, 2010
  - Welcome by Local Officials
- 8:45 a.m. 1. Consent Calendar (*Decision*)** *Board Chair*
- a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – March 25, 2010  
Resolution #2010-09

- 8:50 a.m. 2. Management Report (*Briefing*)** *Kaleen Cottingham*
- a. Director's Report
  - b. Fiscal Report
  - c. Summary of 2010 Supplemental Budget Impacts
  - d. Grant Management Report *Marguerite Austin*
    - Alternate projects funded *Scott Robinson*
  - e. Policy Report *Steve McLellan*
    - Potential grant programs for community gardens
    - Process and timeline for developing sustainability criteria

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT:** *For issues not identified as agenda items. Please limit comments to 3 minutes.*

### **BOARD DECISIONS AND BRIEFINGS**

- 9:30 a.m. 3. Boating Infrastructure Grants: Request to Delegate Authority to Director** *Marguerite Austin*  
Resolution #2010-10

**9:40 a.m. BREAK**

- 10:00 a.m. 4. Acquisition Policy Updates and Potential Changes** *Leslie Ryan-Connelly*  
a. Staff Approach and Timeline through June 30, 2011 *via conference call*

- 10:30 a.m. 5. Conversion Request: City of Newcastle, May Creek Trail Addition, RCO #91-211** *Laura Moxham*  
*via conference call*  
Resolution #2010-11

- 11:00 a.m. 6. Request for Board Guidance: City of Kent Stormwater Proposal RCO #04-1143 (Clark Lake Park Expansion 04)** *Karl Jacobs*  
*via conference call*

**11:30 a.m. Opportunity for additional public comment via conference call from Olympia**

**11:45 a.m. BREAK FOR LUNCH**

- 12:30 p.m. 7. Performance Review and Board Work Plan** *Rebecca Connolly*
- a. RCO Performance for Fiscal Year 2010
  - b. Agency Strategic Plan and Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan
  - c. Review Board Strategic Plan and Adopt Board's Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan
  - d. Deliverables for Director's Evaluation and Process Discussion *Board Chair*

- 1:45 p.m. 8. Preparing for the 2011 Legislative Session** *Steve McLellan*
- a. Potential requests for legislation
  - b. Operating and capital budget requests for 2011-13

**2:30 p.m. State Agency Partner Reports**

**2:45 p.m. ADJOURN**

Next meeting: August 20, 2010 Olympia, WA and conference call

**June 2010****Project Itinerary**

- 9:30 a.m. Meet at the lobby of the Holiday Inn Express and Suites Richland (1970 Center Parkway, Richland, WA 99352**
- 9:45 a.m. Depart from the hotel**  
Directions from the hotel to Clover Island are at the end of this memo.
- 10:00 a.m. Meet at Clover Island**  
Sacagawea Heritage Trail  
Columbia Park  
Hanford Reach Gateway Dock
- 12:30 p.m. Tour concludes**  
Lunch is on your own. Please leave the Tri-Cities area no later than 2 p.m. to ensure that you arrive in Walla Walla by 3:15 p.m. for the meeting with the State Parks Commission

**Project Details****Site #1: Clover Island, Port of Kennewick**

The board funded two projects at Clover Island. The first replaced the guest moorage, improving safety and making it accessible to people with disabilities. The marina is the only publicly owned marina in the area, which has more than 10,000 registered boats. The second, which is still in active status, will restore shoreline habitat for salmon and develop a meandering, riverfront pathway along Clover Island's perimeter. Work will include adding benches, railings, and renovated viewpoints along the Columbia River and creating sidewalks to the island's boat dock that are accessible to people with disabilities. Crews will improve the river habitat for salmon by planting native plants along the river's banks. The pathway will link the island to the regional Sacagawea Heritage Trail and will accommodate activities such as walking, bicycling, and skating.

Name	Fund	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Clover Island Marina Replacement	Boating Facilities Program	3/1/2007	\$144,339	\$577,356	\$721,695	Closed Complete
Clover Island Improvement Project	Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account	8/24/2009	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	Active

## Site #2: Sacagawea Heritage Trail, Kennewick Parks & Recreation Department

The first project involved development of 1.6 miles of a 12 foot wide meandering regional trail and amenities along the Columbia River on top of the riverfront U.S. Army Corps levee. Work on the levee created several additional acres of usable open space suitable for future park development. The second grant helped to develop 10 acres along a 12-foot-wide, meandering, riverfront regional trail and provided trail amenities such as benches, picnic tables, a basketball court and a drinking fountain.

The trail serves all age groups and supports activities such as walking, bicycling, skating, jogging, bird watching, pet walking, along with all the recreational activities on the water.

Name	Grant Program	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Sacagawea Trail/ Riverfront Improvements	Land and Water Conservation Fund	10/23/2006	\$238,801	\$266,770	\$505,571	Closed Complete
Sacagawea Heritage Trail		11/1/2004	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,500,000	

## Site #3: Columbia Park

Columbia Park is a 380-acre regional waterfront park. The board has funded many projects at the park through several grant programs. The tour will stop at the aquatic playground, which includes a community picnic and water-play recreation feature in the east end. The project included remodeling an existing restroom to code; constructing a group picnic shelter, horseshoe court, trail segment to connect to a riverfront trail, zero-depth aquatic spray playground, and related amenities. The features are in a 15-acre family use area, adjacent to a family fishing pond, play structure, and improved parking.

Name	Grant Program	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Columbia Park Aquatic Playground	WWRP Local Parks	8/1/2001	\$265,265	\$265,265	\$530,531	Closed Complete

## Site #4: Hanford Reach Gateway Dock

This project was designed to meet the transient moorage and shore service needs of large recreational vessels on the Columbia River in southeastern Washington. The site has restrooms,


showers, picnic shelters and shade trees. It is within walking distance of restaurants, museums, entertainment, hotels and services. The project included a 150-foot moorage dock with shore access by an ADA accessible ramp. Other elements are utilities, informational kiosks, interpretive signage about the history, ecology, and geology of the Columbia River, and dock amenities such as lighting, seating and tie-ups.

Name	Type	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Hanford Reach Gateway Dock	Boating Infrastructure Grant	9/30/2002	\$254,915	\$336,053	\$590,968	Closed Complete

### Directions from Hotel to Clover Island Marina

The Holiday Inn Express and Suites Richland is at 1970 Center Parkway, Richland, WA 99352. We are meeting at the Clover Island Marina, which is about 300 Clover Island Drive. The drive is 6.5 miles and should take about 10 minutes.

- Head east on Tapteal Dr
- Take the 1st right toward N Belfair Pl
- Take the 1st left onto N Belfair Pl
- Turn left at W Arrowhead Ave
- Continue onto N Columbia Center Blvd
- Merge onto WA-240 E via the ramp to Kennewick
- Take the exit toward W Columbia Dr
- Keep left at the fork to continue toward W Columbia Dr
- Keep left at the fork to continue toward W Columbia Dr
- Turn right at W Columbia Dr
- Turn left at N Washington St
- Continue onto Clover Is/Clover Island Dr





# Investing Sustainably and Sustaining Our Investments

---

## A Joint Discussion between the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board and the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission

Both the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board and the State Parks and Recreation Commission have undertaken efforts to better define sustainability policies as they relate to each agency's work. This discussion is designed to explore whether there are:

- Common elements to these approaches,
- Common questions that need to be answered, and
- Areas where further joint research and discussions may be fruitful.

Staff from State Parks and the Recreation and Conservation Office prepared the following briefing to help focus the discussion.

---

*Location: Walla Walla  
Community College*

*Date: June 24, 2010*

*Time: 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.*

*Facilitated by  
RCO and Parks staff*

---

### Defining "Sustainability"

"Sustainability" is a concept that has many definitions. One useful definition is that sustainability is a way of meeting present needs, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, while integrating environmental protection, economic needs, and social concerns.

Being public agencies involved in the natural or outdoor environment gives us the opportunity, or some would say "mandate", to lead by example when it comes to addressing sustainability. Have we adopted strong enough policies or priorities that incorporate sustainability? Is sustainability embedded in the way we fund, design and build parks, trails, boat launches, and other recreational facilities? Is sustainability a part of our decision-making process on where we acquire new parks, how we place those projects on the landscape, what we include to minimize future environmental issues, or how we develop today to reduce future maintenance needs? *Building any recreation facility disturbs the environment. Permits are issued to guide minimizing*

*these impacts. The question before us today is when and how should we, as public recreation providers, go farther than merely meeting regulatory requirements.*

On-going effects can be further minimized by use of sustainable development techniques and materials such as minimizing the amount of land cleared or paved, using pervious surfaces for trails, roads and parking, building green roofs on buildings, planting “low or no mow” landscaping, incorporating bioswales to capture stormwater, and using recycled equipment or materials.

The cost/benefit implications vary by project and approach.

- Some of these techniques are less expensive than alternatives to construct and/or maintain.
- Other techniques have high initial investments that may be recouped over time through lower energy or water consumption or less maintenance.
- Still others can be justified only if broader societal costs are considered, outside of regular park construction and maintenance budgets.

Economic prosperity is also enhanced by sustainable investment: that is, investment that lasts. An important part of the state’s investment in new facilities has been the principle of sustaining the investment over time. We have done this by requiring that properties acquired or improved with public resources remain in the public domain and open for use in perpetuity. With recent economic pressures, and reduced capital and operating budgets, now is the time to consider using sustainable practices to help prioritize and stretch our recreational funding.

Both the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board and the Parks and Recreation Commission share the commitment to acquiring, developing and maintaining the best of Washington’s natural and recreational resources. The current economic pressures have created greater urgency for discussions, like ours, about how to sustain the value of recreation and conservation investments over time.

## **Potential Areas of Focused Discussion**

Knowing that the RCFB and Parks Commission have limited time for this session, staff suggests that the board members focus discussion on where the actions of each body might complement each other as they implement the missions given to them by the legislature. While the list below encompasses more topics than can likely be discussed in the time available, they serve as examples of the types of sustainability steps each agency individually (or together) might undertake.

- Are there “sustainable practices” that make sense to require now because they are cheaper to build and to operate?
- Should higher priority or more grant funding be provided for projects which demonstrate sustainable practices?



- Should any additional up-front costs of sustainable elements be eligible for grant funding?
- Are there some sustainable practices that should be given greater weight in projects than others? Examples: reducing greenhouse gas emissions, using green building practices and products, using native plantings or no mow/low mow lawns, etc.

Staff also recommends that the RCFB and Parks Commission address possible next steps for this collaboration including additional research by staff and future joint dialogues between the RCFB and the Commission.

## **Attachments**

- A. Current sustainability statement from the Commission
- B. Summary of sustainability white paper issued by RCFB staff
- C. Brief summaries of prior efforts to quantify investment needs (legacy at risk, DNR sustainable recreation, others)
- D. Introductory information about board members

## **Attachment A**

### **WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S POLICY SUSTAINABILITY GOALS AND PLAN**

#### **Policy (Adopted June 2008)**

It is the policy of the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission that the ethic of sustainability and the practice and actions of "being green" be integrated into every aspect of agency operation so that Washington State Parks will be the sustainability leader among state parks nationwide.

#### **Goals and Plan**

The State Parks' Sustainability Team developed a series of goals to guide agency sustainability activities through 2020. Although these goals represent staff's best look into the future, the field of sustainability and green technology continues to make rapid advances. These goals will therefore require periodic refinement and update to remain relevant as policy direction.

#### **1. Energy Conservation (reduce energy demand)**

There are three major ways to affect the agency's demand for energy. First, using equipment and fixtures with the latest efficiency technology can create significant energy and cost savings. Second, adopting new modern standards for structures we build will assure that they are as energy efficient as possible. Third, modifying the behavior of those that have control over energy consumption can create significant savings by creating an attitude that supports energy conservation as an operational practice.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will reduce its net consumption of electric energy and non-renewable heating fuels (e.g., oil, natural gas, and propane) to 1990 levels (goal adapted from ESSSB 5560; Chapter 519, Laws of 2009).

#### **2. Switch to Renewable Energy Sources**

One way to make agency operation more sustainable is to purchase or produce energy generated from renewable sources. By increasing the proportion of energy coming from renewable sources, we reduce our dependence on finite resources and build energy-generating capability that taps resources that will last forever. Examples of renewable energy sources include biofuels, wind energy, tidal energy, and solar energy. Many utilities now offer mechanisms through which customers can buy "green electricity" generated from renewable sources.

Developing renewable energy generating facilities in state parks is another way to achieve this goal. To limit disruption of the park experience, these facilities should principally seek to

produce the amount of energy needed to operate the park in which the facility is located. Facilities should only be located where consistent with Commission-adopted land classifications and other applicable resource management policies.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will purchase and/or produce 30% of its electrical energy needs from renewable sources (goal is twice the rate required of electric utilities by Initiative 937 in 2006).

### **3. Transportation Efficiency**

A major portion of the agency's energy consumption is the fleet of vehicles used to conduct daily business. Park operation requires a wide array of vehicle types – everything from semi tractor-trailer trucks to electric carts. Making wise selections in the types of vehicles deployed can greatly reduce fuel consumption. Strategically staging vehicles to allow sharing among parks can also reduce the number of large vehicles needed. Supporting mass transit and energy efficient alternatives to the personal automobile for getting employees to and from work is another way the agency can significantly lessen its energy consumption.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) Achieve a corporate average vehicle fuel economy of 36 miles per gallon (goal adapted from ESSSB 5560; Chapter 519, Laws of 2009)
- b) Reduce commute trip mileage by 50% from a 2009 baseline
- c) Increase the fleet share of hybrids and plug-in electric vehicles to 25%

### **4. Reduce Water Use**

Potable water is becoming an increasingly scarce resource. In some parts of the country, withdrawal of water exceeds recharge and water tables are dropping. In Washington, it was long thought that water was a limitless resource. We now know this is far from the case. To meet future demand for potable water we need to use water wisely, reuse it wherever possible, and return it to the environment in as clean a state as possible.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will apply water collection, conservation, and recycling technology at 50 parks and therefore reduce potable water use by 50% in those parks.

### **5. Waste Management**

Reduce, reuse, recycle is the core of sustainability. State Parks and the people who visit our parks can work together to reduce the amount of material that is sent to landfills every year. Efficient recycling and composting programs can reduce the waste stream significantly. We are geographically challenged by access to local and regional programs that support recycling and composting but innovation can overcome many of these challenges.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will divert 80% of current waste from landfills by achieving 100% recycling of metals, plastics, paper products, and glass and by composting at least 50% of organic wastes.

## **6. Sustainable Environments**

In general, the most sustainable landscapes in any of our parks are natural environments. By modeling built landscapes on native landscapes, we can achieve increased sustainability and reduce maintenance and energy costs. The desire for designed recreational landscapes (e.g., picnic areas with lawns) will likely persist – particularly in arid regions. However, we can adapt new technologies and design principles to reduce the developed footprint and dependence on irrigation, fertilization, chemical weed control, and energy consumptive maintenance activities (e.g., mowing, trimming, blowing).

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) reduce water consumption by incorporating xeriscaping design principles and use of native plants in the development and redevelopment of recreational landscapes in parks
- b) maintain park lawns with highly restricted application of herbicides, pesticides and fertilizers
- c) use an IPM (integrated pest management) approach to managing noxious/invasive weeds in all parks and ensure replacement of invasive species with suitable native plants

## **7. Measuring and Monitoring**

Within state government, there is an increasing demand for accurate accounting for the resources we expend. Measuring improvements is always based on a comparison against some baseline measure. In order to accurately measure and report our progress and to inform ourselves about where we can improve, we need to collect and track the necessary data.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) consistently track recycling; waste disposal; and consumption of electricity, water, and vehicle fuel in all parks and administrative facilities
- b) incentivize and recognize sustainability-related performance of parks and staff through a “green parks” accreditation program and a “green staff” certification program

## **8. Communication, Education, Interpretation**

Without a way to communicate the purpose and aims of sustainability, we stand little chance of success. Achieving the agency’s sustainability goals will require that we effectively communicate with agency staff, policy makers, and the public. Interpreting sustainability to the public will become an increasingly central function in state parks. The agency should work to develop interpretive methodology, programs, funding strategies, and partnerships to instill a sustainability ethic in park visitors and Washington residents.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) provide sustainability-related interpretation to the public at all staffed parks
- b) provide the public current sustainability information on the agency’s website and through other public information campaigns
- c) include sustainability training at ranger in-service trainings and the Stewardship Certification Program

## **9. Environmentally Preferred Products**

From recycled paper to cleaning products that are non-toxic and biodegradable, Environmentally Preferred Products (EPPs) advance sustainability in several ways. These products are easier to recycle, reduce energy consumption, and lessen release of toxins into the environment. Purchase and use of EPPs helps support green industry, reduces pollution, and lessens threats to human health.

Goal: The agency will immediately purchase only one hundred percent recycled copy and printing paper (reflects SHB 2287; Chapter 356, Laws of 2009)

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) apply only paints with low amounts of volatile organic compounds
- b) adopt an EPP policy for cleaning, painting, and other maintenance-related chemical products

## **10. Reduce Toxics Entering the Environment**

Through a sustainability-driven approach to operational and purchasing decisions, we can significantly reduce the amount of toxics released into the environment. While perhaps overlapping considerably with other goals, reducing release of toxics nevertheless merits distinct consideration.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) adopt a policy on use of toxic substances in parks and agency facilities
- b) provide appropriate training to all staff who handle toxic substances
- c) use an IPM (integrated pest management) approach to managing noxious/invasive weeds in all parks

## **11. Sustainable Building Practices and Materials**

State law already requires that buildings over 5,000 square feet meet green building standards (RCW 39.35D.030). Although the new State Parks headquarters in Tumwater is one of the state's first LEED-gold office buildings, structures in state parks rarely reach this threshold. State Parks should devise a system similar to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) to apply to our smaller buildings to ensure they are as sustainable and efficient as possible. Low Impact Design (LID) guidelines seek to minimize a site's develop footprint and encourage re-use, and where appropriate, removal of existing structures and other impervious surfaces. The agency should also adapt these LID principles to guide development of recreational landscapes in parks.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) adopt low impact design guidelines for development of new recreational landscapes
- b) adopt sustainable design standards for buildings of less than 5,000 square feet
- c) adopt guidelines for use of recycled materials in park construction projects

## **12. Reducing Our Carbon Footprint**

Like the goal for reducing toxics entering the environment, much of what we achieve in the previous goals helps reduce our carbon footprint. With worldwide concern over global climate change, we need to make decisions that consider and, to the greatest extent possible, reduce release of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gasses into the air.

State Parks' large collection of historical structures provides a relatively rare opportunity to demonstrate a fundamental approach to reduction of carbon footprint. The notion of "embodied energy" refers to the energy and resources already expended to construct a building, including material extraction, manufacturing, and transportation. While approximately 43% of America's carbon emissions come from the operation of buildings, this figure does not include embodied energy (the energy consumed in the construction of buildings ranges from 15 to 30 times the annual energy use of the building). Historic buildings, in particular, represent a high amount of embodied energy and are by their nature more sustainable than many recent buildings given their higher quality and longer life span of materials used and designs that accurately respond to the local climate. The concept of embodied energy leads to the conclusion that the greenest building is one that is already built.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) reduce its carbon foot print 15% from a 2005 baseline (goal reflects ESSSB 5560; Chapter 519, Laws of 2009)
- b) work with its partner organizations to provide a mechanism for visitors to off-set the carbon footprint of their visit
- c) explore and if feasible, participate in carbon credit programs and third party forest practices certification efforts such as the Forest Stewardship Council standards

## **13. Partnerships**

Sustainability and resource conservation does not end at park boundaries. The agency must recognize that parks lie within a larger environmental context where park and global sustainability are inexorably linked. Staff currently shares stewardship and sustainability-related expertise and cooperates with other institutions and colleagues on numerous inter-agency and non-profit committees, councils, boards, and other policy setting, information sharing, and advisory bodies. The Commission also enters into interagency and cooperative agreements with numerous government entities and non-profits to advance sustainability and conservation initiatives. While mindful of potential mission creep, the agency should encourage, expand, and formalize relationships with its neighbors and partners to build its sustainability capabilities and extend their effectiveness.

Goal: By 2020, the agency will

- a) attain a leadership role on the Governor's Statewide Interagency Sustainability Committee
- b) demonstrate a leadership role in conserving and protecting the natural and cultural heritage of Washington State
- c) expand and formalize partnerships with public institutions, conservation-oriented non-profit organizations, and the private sector to advance the agency's sustainability goals

## Attachment B

### Approaches to Policies to Promote Sustainability through the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board

#### Executive Summary

**Definition.** Both the Office of Financial Management and the Department of Ecology currently define *sustainability* as "... a holistic approach to living and problem solving that addresses social equity, environmental health, and economic prosperity. To be sustainable, the economy must support a high quality of life for all people in a way that protects our health, our limited natural resources, and our environment."<sup>1</sup>

The common themes to be found in these recent definitions are: the environment, the economy, and people (health, human resources, social concerns). RCFB grants address all three themes.

**Key findings.** While *managed* recreation is sustainable; *unmanaged or undermanaged* recreation may not be sustainable. "Sustainability" standards for recreation facilities do not exist. While there is some overlap of facilities (e.g., parking, restrooms) among the huge variety of outdoor recreation activities, different forms of recreation require different facilities, which in turn should be treated with different standards: ball fields cannot be compared to trails, which cannot be compared to boat ramps.

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and the Sustainable Sites Initiative (SSI) offer development guidelines. However, neither LEED nor SSI criteria are relevant to a substantial portion of the RCFB's portfolio. Developing an appropriate set of guidelines would be an important task to help park and recreation developers who wish to protect natural resources.

**Unsustainable grant programs?** For grant project and RCO administrative funding, RCFB manages and depends on a number of programs that at first glance appear to be inconsistent with state law that encourages reductions in vehicle miles traveled and use of fossil fuels that generate CO<sub>2</sub> pollutants. The Boating Facilities Program, Boating Infrastructure Grant (BIG) Program, the Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) Program, and the Recreational Trails Program (RTP) are all based on funding derived from the consumption of gasoline. To a certain extent, these three grant programs encourage the use of fossil fuels as part of the recreational experience (motorized boating, driving to boat launches, and driving to trail heads in more rural areas).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ofm.wa.gov/sustainability/default.asp> and *A Field Guide to Sustainability connecting concepts with action*, Ecology, publication #03-04-005 (Rev. October 2007)

In the broadest terms, it could be argued that these emissions are a small part of the national “carbon” total that is subject to current and on-going national and international debate and negotiation.

**The Future of Gasoline and the Sustainability of the RCFB.** Because the RCFB and its RCO administrators depend on gasoline taxes to pay for administrative costs, it needs to be concerned about larger issues of gasoline use and supply. In the short run, per capita gasoline sales are falling, and with it gasoline tax revenue.<sup>2</sup>

Obviously, if people travel less or drive more fuel efficient vehicles and as a result buy less gasoline over time, RCFB would receive less revenue over time for its programs – and for the agency that supports it. This decline could be tempered by an increasing state population. If the revenue trend continues downward, the question could then become how long the funding sources, grant programs, the Board, and the agency will be economically sustainable. Losing this structure could compromise or endanger the past investments made in land and infrastructure statewide.

**Options for RCFB Action.** The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board may approach sustainability policy in three broad and interrelated areas: agency policy, agency planning, and grant programs.

*Policy:* RCFB could consider crafting any number of general Board and agency policies regarding sustainability. RCFB would be well served by ensuring that existing policies are aligned before making new demands of its clients.

Moving into more complex policy areas, RCFB could decide that it needs to assume it has responsibility to reduce or mitigate for emissions attributable to motor boating or NOVA activities. This could be done in part by recognizing projects that go above the minimum required for storm water control, use of recycled materials, use of sustainable technology, and so on.

*Planning:* RCFB could direct RCO staff to incorporate sustainability concepts in internal policy and client planning requirements.

*Grant Programs:* Of all the activities that RCFB oversees, there is no doubt that the grant programs have the most influence outside of the agency. The RCFB could adjust grant program policies and rules to promote a sustainability agenda in at least three ways.

1. *Recommend* that sponsors consider sustainable practices.
2. *Reward* those sponsors who follow sustainable practices with evaluation points.
3. *Require* sustainable practices as an eligibility criterion.

---

<sup>2</sup> Transportation Revenue Forecast Council, June 2009 *Transportation Economic and Revenue Forecasts*, Volume 1, Summary Document, Washington State Department of Transportation.



RCO staff has been directed to develop a work plan emphasizing recommending and rewarding. Staff has drafted a work plan to develop sustainability criteria to incorporate into select grant programs in a pilot program.

### Summary of State Laws and Executive Orders

Statute or Executive Order	Applicability to RCFB Grant Programs	Comments
36.70A RCW, Growth Management Act	High	RCFB policy encourages planning and rewards compliance with GMA
RCW 39.04.133 preference for recycled materials	Mixed – uncertain connection to acquisition projects	No policy in place
RCW 39.35D.030 buildings to LEED standards	Low, funded structures do not meet minimum size	Sustainable Sites Initiative may be more relevant
43.21C state environmental policy	Low in programs funding federal projects, high in all others	SEPA check lists may be evidence of applicant's "readiness to proceed"
RCW 47.01.440 reduce vehicle miles traveled	Mixed	Boating, NOVA, and RTP may be problematic
70.95 RCW solid waste management	Not applicable	
Executive Order 02-03 sustainable practices by state agencies	Low	Agency specific, not applicable to grant clients
Executive Order 05-01 sustainability goals for state agencies	Low	Agency specific, not applicable to grant clients
Executive Order 07-02 Washington Climate Challenge	Mixed	Boating, NOVA, and RTP may be problematic
Executive Order 09-05 Washington's leadership on climate change	Mixed	Uncertain relationship

## Attachment C

### Brief summaries of prior efforts to quantify investment needs

#### ***Recreation Coalition***, December 1989

Public meetings across the state generated lists of desired projects, especially land acquisition. Some discussion of maintenance and operations needs. No documentation in terms of dollars, but recommended a 10-year funding package of \$450,000,000 to acquire critical lands as soon as possible.

#### ***Operation and Maintenance Needs of State-Owned Habitat, Natural Areas, Parks, and Other Recreation Sites***, December 1990

Study coordinated by RCO, found one-time catch up need of \$30,119,000 for State Parks, \$9,390,000 by Fish and Wildlife. Also identified annual shortfall of \$2,308,000 (Parks), \$2,532,000 (DNR), and \$6,059,000 (WDFW)

#### ***Legacy at Risk: State Wildlife and Recreation Lands Management Task Force Report***, 1992

Report of the State Wildlife and Recreational Lands Management Task Force. Task Force coordinated by RCO. Identified one-time maintenance and operation (M&O) catch up need of \$31,000,000 for State Parks, \$2,200,000 for DNR, and \$27,900,000 for WDFW. Also identified on-going biennial shortfall of \$21,300,000 for Parks, \$7,200,000 for DNR, and \$12,900,000 for WDFW.

#### ***Legislative Task Force on Local Parks and Recreation Maintenance and Operation***, report issued December 2001

"The findings and recommendations of the 2001 Legislative Task Force on Local Parks and Recreation Maintenance and Operations parallel those of past committees, and thus will sound familiar to State and local elected officials, parks and recreation representatives and advocates, and the citizens of Washington." No documentation of dollar needs, lots of anecdotes and use of the word "crisis."

Report resulted in expanded state law regarding establishment of metropolitan park districts.

#### ***State Parks and Outdoor Recreation Task Force (SPORF) Recommendations to the State Legislature***, December 2002

Findings summarized in the following table: State Parks and Outdoor Recreation Funding Needs

	<b>State Parks &amp; Recreation Commission</b>	<b>Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife</b>	<b>Department of Natural Resources</b>	<b>Total</b>
Biennial Operating Needs	\$27.3	\$4.4	\$6.0	<b>\$37.7</b>
Maintenance & Equipment	\$41.2	\$9.1	\$3.5	<b>\$53.8</b>
Major Capital Improvements	\$292.7	\$0	\$0	<b>\$292.7</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$361.2</b>	<b>\$13.5</b>	<b>\$9.5</b>	<b>\$384.2</b>

"In addition to these stated needs, the Task Force heard discussion of maintenance and operation shortfalls in local park systems. The recommendations of the Task Force address both state and local needs."

#### **Study Committee on Outdoor Recreation (SCOR), State Legislature 2006.**

Chaired by Representative Dunshee, the Committee asked about how to determine the need for outdoor recreation sites and facilities, especially ball fields. Resulted in RCO budget proviso to develop a "level of service" proposal.

#### ***Washington Boater Needs Assessment*, Responsive Management 2007**

No documentation in dollars. Found "There is a clear, immediate need for additional funding for boating programs and services in Washington. In the survey of boaters, large majorities of boaters indicated needs for increased law enforcement and education, as well as for additions and improvements to boating facilities. These included access, launch ramps, parking at launch ramps, and improved docks, restrooms, fish cleaning stations, and other features currently in disrepair. Boating services providers expressed concern about a lack of resources for boater safety, access, launch ramps and facilities, law enforcement, and education."

#### **Sustainable Recreation Work Group Final Report to the Washington State Legislature, DNR, December 2009.**

"To sustainably manage its current facilities and trails, DNR would need an annual budget of about \$16 million to provide planning, maintenance, renovation, law enforcement presence, and management and administrative costs."

"On average, developing a new landscape would cost about \$7.2 million, which includes four new facilities and 30 miles of trails."

#### **2010 Joint Transportation Committee**

Budget proviso to "... document future identified off-road, snowmobile, and marine funding needs."

## Attachment D

### Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Member Profiles (from RCO website)

#### **Bill Chapman** Chair

Appointed to the board in 2004, Mr. Chapman was appointed as chair by Governor Chris Gregoire in March 2009. A long-time Mercer Island resident, Chapman is a partner with the Seattle law firm of Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Preston Gates Ellis LLP, where he handles land use and environmental compliance issues. Chapman serves as chairman of the Mercer Island Planning Commission and on the boards of several nonprofit organizations. He is a founder and the current president of the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust, a nonprofit organization created in 1990 by a group of concerned citizens to save the forested landscape along Interstate 90 from Cle Elum through Snoqualmie Pass to Seattle. He also is a founding board member and past president of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, a nonprofit organization that raises funds for grants to local communities to acquire land for outdoor recreation and wildlife habitat protection. He enjoys the outdoors by hiking and climbing. Mr. Chapman graduated from Harvard University in environmental engineering sciences and received his law degree from the University of Virginia.

#### **Karen Daubert**

Ms. Daubert, of Seattle, has more than 15 years experience in parks policy, advocacy, and funding issues. She was hired as the first executive director of the Seattle Parks Foundation in August 2001, where she works currently. Ms. Daubert has been appointed to several boards and commissions including the Planning Commission, the Seattle Board of Parks Commissioners, the Pro Parks 2000 Committee, and the Pro Parks Oversight Committee. She received a bachelor of science degree from the University of Washington and a law degree from Seattle University.

#### **Steven Drew**

Mr. Drew, of Olympia, works as an independent insurance adjuster in his own firm. He has been active with the Issaquah Alps Trail Club and several environmental nonprofit organizations. In support of these organizations, he has written or carried out a number of grants aimed at trail construction, riparian and salmon habitat restoration, and environmental education. He and his wife, Kathleen recently moved to Olympia from Issaquah and enjoy hiking, camping, boating, bird watching, and fishing.

#### **Jeff Parsons**

Mr. Parsons, of Leavenworth, serves as the director of the Barn Beach Reserve. The reserve is a multi-purpose, non-profit facility, including a museum, environmental learning center, and arts facility housed in a historic home on 5 acres in downtown Leavenworth. Appropriately, the reserve is next to a Leavenworth city park, Blackbird Island, which was funded with RCFB-issued Land and Water Conservation Fund grants in the 1960s. Mr. Parsons, a Washington native, spent his childhood in eastern Washington. He attended Washington State University and then graduated from The Evergreen State College. He served in various capacities on the staff of the

Washington's House of Representatives for 11 years, and worked for the Marine Safety Office and People for Puget Sound. For almost seven years, he was executive director for Audubon Washington, supporting the 26 local chapters of the Audubon Society in Washington. He and his wife Chris have been Leavenworth residents since 2003.

### **Harriet Spanel**

Ms. Spanel, of Bellingham, recently retired from a 22-year career in the legislature, where she represented Skagit, Whatcom, and San Juan Counties. Her legislative career, the majority of which was spent in the Senate, is marked by several overall policy themes: women and children, education, environment, transportation, and good government. Ms. Spanel sponsored many bills to restore salmon habitats and protect fisheries and led the way on several oil spill protection and pipeline safety laws. She co-sponsored the 1990 Growth Management Act and was instrumental in getting legislation passed to allow counties to use up to 1 percent of real estate excise tax to acquire and maintain conservation areas. Before being elected to the legislature, Ms. Spanel worked on a variety of federal, state, and local issues. She is a past member of the Bellingham Planning Commission and the Parks and Recreation Board. She has been a long-time member of the League of Women Voters and the Women's Political Caucus, and is an active member of the Sehome Neighborhood Association. She is a commissioner on the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, a member of the Washington State Historical Society Board of Trustees, and member of The Danish Immigrant Museum Board.

## **Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission Member Profiles (from Commission website)**

### **Fred Olson, Chair Olympia**

Fred Olson recently retired from Washington State Government. During his career with the state, he served as Deputy Director of the Department of Ecology, Director of Administration for the Office of the Attorney General, and prior to retirement was Deputy Chief of Staff for Governor Chris Gregoire. Before joining state government he worked for 17 years in the newspaper business as a reporter and managing editor of The Olympian. Olson serves on the Board of Directors for the Washington State Employees Credit Union. He is a Washington native, an outdoors enthusiast, and is committed to helping make the state's recreational, cultural, historical, and natural resources available to the public through the parks system.

**Joe Taller, Vice Chair****Olympia**

Joe Taller has served in both public and private sectors. He joined the Boeing Company in 1957 and retired in 1997 after having worked in engineering, industrial relations and community affairs. He directed the company's corporate contributions and K-12 education program and managed several areas of human resources at the corporate headquarters level. Taller has served the public as a Washington state representative, elected three times from the 36th district and was director of the Washington State Office of Financial Management between 1981 and 1985. He was executive director of Washington Promise and state director of Communities in Schools. An active Washington citizen, Taller has been board vice president of the Washington State Historical Society and was a founding board member of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition. He also has served as a member on the American Red Cross National Board of Governors and the Heritage College Board of Directors.

**Rodger Schmitt, Secretary****Port Townsend**

Rodger Schmitt has been a board member for the Jefferson Land Trust in Port Townsend since 2004, currently serving as treasurer. Prior to moving to Washington state in 2003, he spent 23 years with the U.S. Bureau of Land Management in several states and held a range of leadership positions, including national recreation director in Washington, D.C., from 1997 to 2003. He also served as deputy associate director of the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors in the mid-1980s and early in his career worked for 12 years as a park ranger and assistant park manager with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in California. He has served as an officer and advisor for many park and natural resources organizations and boards. He and his wife, Jill, live in Port Townsend. They have three daughters and three grandchildren. In his leisure time, he enjoys traveling, hiking, kayaking and photography.

**Patricia T. Lantz****Gig Harbor**

Patricia T. Lantz is a retired lawyer and former legislator in the Washington House of Representatives. She practiced law in the areas of land-use planning and environmental law, served on the House Natural Resources Committee and chaired the Heritage Caucus, comprised of state parks, arts, cultural resources, civics and historic preservation organizations and advocates from around the state. A current board member of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, her many memberships also include the Washington State Trust for Historic Preservation and Tahoma Audubon. She has received numerous awards for her work in historic preservation, arts advocacy and promotion of criminal and civil justice. She believes that parks are essential to people for recreation, renewal and for the preservation of the state's history and culture. Commissioner Lantz and her husband John live on Raft Island near Gig Harbor, where they raised their three children. They enjoy their grandchildren, as well as hiking, bicycling, kayaking and exploring the backroads of Washington.

**Eliot Scull****East Wenatchee**

Eliot Scull is a retired ophthalmologist who was raised on the East Coast and moved to Seattle in 1967. He and his wife Tina relocated to Wenatchee eight years later, where they have practiced medicine ever since. Scull's lifelong interest in the outdoors has led him to serve as chair of the Chelan County Parks Board, a trustee of the Washington state chapter of the Nature Conservancy and two terms on the board of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (including one term as chairman). He is a co-founder and current president of the Chelan-Douglas Land Trust. He also is a former board member of the San Juan Preservation Trust, where he holds the emeritus position of Land Counselor. He believes strongly in public lands and particularly in State Parks as an important responsibility of Washington state government. He wants to see a healthy and growing system of parks across the state.

**Cecilia Vogt****Yakima**

Cecilia Vogt is recently retired, having served since April 2002, as executive director of the Yakima Valley Chapter of the American Red Cross. Prior to that, she was owner of Cecilia Vogt Consulting, assisting non-profit organizations and businesses with image promotion, strategic planning, fund-raising, meeting facilitation and special projects. She served for three years as public relations director, then eight years as executive director of the Yakima Greenway Foundation, a 3600-acre private, non-profit land trust. She earned her Bachelor of Arts degree in public relations with a minor in environmental studies at Central Washington University in 1988. Her other affiliations include serving as co-founder and past president of the Washington State Trails Coalition; member of the Red Cross Washington State Service Council; Yakima Rotary Club member; former member of the Yakima Bike/Pedestrian Advisory Committee; board member of Cowiche Canyon Conservancy and board member of Central Washington Comprehensive Mental Health. She is an avid outdoors enthusiast, parks user, hiker, cyclist and skier with a passion for protecting the environment.

**Lucinda S. Whaley****Spokane**

Lucinda "Cindy" S. Whaley is an attorney in a Spokane-based law firm. Her practice focuses on complex commercial litigation and employment law. She is active in many bar activities, advises businesses and non-profit organizations and has been an adjunct professor of law. Prior to attending Gonzaga Law School, she worked as Congressional staff in Washington D.C., later moving to Spokane, where she worked on Spokane's EXPO '74. She has a longtime interest in winter skiing and also enjoys bicycling, golf and gardening. She and her husband and teenage daughter spend time fishing and boating on the Pend Oreille River and also enjoy touring Washington state.





Recreation and Conservation Funding Board  
Revised Resolution #2010-09  
June 2010 Consent Agenda

**BE IT RESOLVED**, that the following June 2010 Consent Agenda item is approved:

- a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – March 25, 2010

Resolution moved by: \_\_\_\_\_

Resolution seconded by: \_\_\_\_\_

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS, MARCH 25, 2010

## Agenda Items without Formal Action

Item	Board Request for Follow-up ( <i>Due Date in Italics</i> )
Management Report	Include details of time extension data with the performance update ( <i>June</i> )
Legislative Session Review	Send a final report at the end of the special session. ( <i>April</i> ) Review the effect of travel restrictions on evaluation and advisory committees ( <i>June</i> )
Incorporating Sustainability into RCO Grant Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff should provide a process and timeline for developing criteria for the following WWRP categories, beginning with the next grant round: State Lands Restoration, Local Parks, and Trails. The process should consider how to work with other boards, and integrate with other policy updates/reviews of incentives where it can be efficiently combined. (<i>June</i>)</li> <li>Staff should consider a discussion with the Parks Commission regarding issues related to sustainability of projects and/or funding.. (<i>June</i>)</li> </ul>
Invasive Species Council Update	Move to June or October meeting

## Agenda Items with Formal Action

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up ( <i>Due Date in Italics</i> )
Consent Calendar	<a href="#">Approved</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>November 2009 Meeting Minutes</li> <li>Advisory Committee Service Recognition</li> <li>Time Extension Requests, Washington Department of Natural Resources</li> </ul>	
Extension of Match Certification for Farmland Projects	<a href="#">Approved</a> as amended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extended the match certification deadline for certain projects until June 30, 2010</li> </ul>	
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Compliance and Conversions	<a href="#">Approved</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approved Phase 2 of the WDFW land exchange and authorized the director to submit the conversion to the National Park Service for approval.</li> </ul>	
Changes to the Evaluation Process for the WWRP Natural Areas Category	<a href="#">Approved</a> as amended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removed the project review meetings and changed to a written evaluation process.</li> <li>Amendment requires RCO to develop an online process for evaluators to share comments, questions, and scores.</li> </ul>	Add questions to applicant survey regarding written versus in person evaluations, and report results. ( <i>October</i> )
Factors for Considering Major Scope Changes – Acquisition Projects	<a href="#">Approved</a> as amended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted factors for board consideration of major scope changes.</li> <li>Amendment changed the first and final paragraphs of the policy so that the language is directive rather than permissive.</li> </ul>	
Policy Changes to WWRP Farmland Preservation Program	<a href="#">Approved</a> as amended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised the environmental values evaluation criteria</li> <li>Updated the program definition to include land that is used primarily for commercial equestrian activities</li> <li>Amendment removed all references to community gardens from the resolution.</li> </ul>	Identify the RCO grant programs that allow community gardens. ( <i>June</i> )  Review process to develop criteria for commercial horse activities. ( <i>October</i> )
Revised Evaluation Criteria for Land and Water Conservation Fund	<a href="#">Approved</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Revised the criteria to include (1) a design question for development projects, (2) an urgency/viability question for acquisitions, and (3) allowance for combination projects to compete by responding to both questions.</li> </ul>	
Policy Regarding Nonprofit Eligibility in WWRP	<a href="#">Approved</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adopted eligibility criteria for nonprofit nature conservancy organizations that apply in the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Riparian and Farmlands categories.</li> </ul>	

# RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

---

Date: March 25, 2010

Place: Natural Resource Building, RM 175, Olympia, Washington

## Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

<b>Bill Chapman, Chair</b>	Mercer Island	<b>Stephen Saunders</b>	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
<b>Steven Drew</b>	Olympia	<b>Rex Derr</b>	Director, State Parks and Recreation
<b>Jeff Parsons</b>	Leavenworth		
<b>Harriet Spanel</b>	Bellingham		
<b>Karen Daubert</b>	Seattle		

**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 Report

Chair Bill Chapman called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Staff called roll, and a quorum was determined. Dave Brittell was not present due to an excused absence.

- The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) approved the agenda as amended to move item #1D to its own topic, and to remove the Invasive Species Council update due to staff illness.
- The board reviewed Revised Resolution #2010-01, Consent Calendar. The resolution was revised to remove item #1D.

**Revised Resolution 2010-01 moved by: Parsons and seconded by: Derr  
Resolution APPROVED**

### Management Report

Director Kaleen Cottingham presented the management report. She noted that gas tax revenues are not coming in as predicted and the reduction will be prorated across all agencies, as shown in notebook item #2b.

### Grant Management Report

Section Manager Marguerite Austin noted that sponsors already have entered 320 applications into PRISM requesting about \$86 million. Most projects do not have funds associated with them yet. Marguerite also highlighted the 2009 LWCF report, which references Blueberry Park on page 7 and lists the unmet needs in the state on page 10.

Section Manager Scott Robinson discussed the portion of the Grass Lake Nature Park conversion involving a sewer line placement. The request was originally before the board in November 2008. He explained the solution approved by the director in 2010, and noted that the ultimate cost was very similar to the original proposal that the board rejected. Steven Drew noted that requests should demonstrate that sponsors made the greatest possible effort to find alternatives to the conversion and negotiate with landowners.

#### Policy Update

Policy Director Steve McLellan described progress made by the Lands Group, and noted that it appears that we are meeting the mark on the legislative intent. Megan Duffy discussed the staff research on ways to manage water rights that are secured through acquisitions. One approach could be the State Trust Water Rights program. Staff is hoping to test it with two pilot projects before proposing any broad policies. Kaleen noted the importance of one policy that works for both boards.

#### Performance

Kaleen Cottingham, Marguerite Austin, and Rebecca Connolly described efforts underway to obtain more outcome metrics from the RCO's project database, PRISM, and to provide data that board members requested regarding time extensions.

#### Legislative Session Review

Policy Director Steve McLellan briefed the board on the 2010 legislative session and supplemental budgets. The capital budget will not be finalized until the revenue package is determined, but the proposed Senate and House versions would not result in cuts to existing WWRP projects. He also reviewed the operating budget proposals and legislation affecting natural resources reform, state agency cutbacks, and related issues.

The board discussed the proposed restrictions on how boards and commissions operate, including the potential travel limitations. Board members agreed that going to other parts of the state is an important part of their work. Unless travel is prohibited, they would like to keep the June meeting in Walla Walla, especially since they have not been to the east side of the state for some time. Members also agreed that it would be important to use technology for testimony from Olympia and reduce the amount of staff travel. Kaleen described the efforts underway to improve the technology.

### **Board Decisions**

The board took action on seven topics, as follows.

### Extension of Match Certification for Farmland Projects

Section Manager Scott Robinson described the match certification issue, and noted that one of the projects will receive the federal grant. Additional money may be coming for two other projects. He would like to amend the resolution to be until the end of June.

Board member Parsons moved to amend the resolution to change April 15 to June 30, seconded by board member Daubert. Chair Chapman noted it was a friendly amendment.

**Resolution 2010-08 moved by: Parsons and seconded by: Daubert**  
**Resolution APPROVED as amended.**

### Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Compliance and Conversions

Grant Manager Jim Anest presented an overview of staff work on compliance and how the RCO is prioritizing the work. He highlighted the efforts underway with the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), describing the situation for projects #02-1109 and #68-603. He explained that finding appropriate replacement property can be very challenging. He also noted that conversions, when well managed, serve a valuable role in helping sponsors adapt to inevitable changes in values and needs over the life of a grant.

Board member Drew suggested that staff should prioritize the most significant or egregious conversions. Jim responded that the RCO has criteria for evaluating conversions, and there is a lot of work just to determine how serious each compliance issue is. Chair Chapman suggested working with partners to identify potential replacement properties.

Grant Manager Leslie Ryan Connelly presented Phase Two of the proposed land exchange between WDFW and the Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR). This portion of the exchange (RCO #69-609A) involves property funded through the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The board's decision would be whether to approve the request for submission to the National Park Service. Board members and staff discussed the following:

- The Yakama Nation is participating in the cultural resources review. There will be an MOU between all parties, including the tribe, that requires compliance with Section 106 for all future activities.
- The land meets the criterion that it was "not managed primarily for recreational purposes" because it is DNR trust land, and recreation is not a primary function.
- It does not appear that the properties include spotted owl habitat because (1) DNR's Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) does not cover such areas and (2) none of the appraisals had an adjustment for the HCP.

**Resolution 2010-02 moved by: Parsons and seconded by: Saunders**  
**Resolution APPROVED**

### Changes to the Evaluation Process for the WWRP Natural Areas Category

Section Manager Scott Robinson gave an overview of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Natural Areas and then reviewed the staff recommendation to (1) eliminate project review meetings and (2) use a written evaluation process in this category. Scott distributed and reviewed the public comment received.

Board members generally supported the proposal, noting that it could be more efficient and less costly for both the RCO and for the agencies that apply for grants. However, they were concerned about the loss of public participation and interaction among evaluators. They discussed concerns and options as follows:

- How should the board balance the need for more efficient and cost-effective evaluations with its reputation for public participation and openness?
- Would written evaluations make it easier for individuals throughout the state to participate as evaluators?
- Should the approach be tested as a one-year pilot only?

Board member Drew moved to adopt an amendment to strike "beginning with" in the last paragraph and replace it with "for." Board member Derr seconded the amendment.

**The motion failed with three in favor and four opposed,**

Board member Parsons moved to adopt an amendment to include the following language in the eighth paragraph of the resolution after the word "category": *"including provision for online public review and comparison of evaluations."* Board member Drew seconded the amendment.

Board members discussed whether an online "virtual conversation" among evaluators could mitigate the loss of interaction. The board also discussed how to mimic the public process so that evaluators could get public comment before completing their evaluation. Members noted that the evaluation meetings do not allow for public comment and that public attendance at the evaluations is low. Public support is part of the criteria for many programs, and most projects in the category have considerable public review before evaluation.

**Board members Parsons and Drew withdrew the motion.**

Board member Parsons moved to adopt an amendment to include the following language in the eighth paragraph of the resolution after the word "category": *"including a virtual discussion/sharing of draft scores between members of the evaluation committee."* Board member Drew seconded the amendment.

**The motion was approved unanimously.**

Board members agreed on the following items for follow-up:

- Add questions to the upcoming applicant survey to evaluate the use of written versus in-person evaluations. Staff should report back on the findings.
- Revisit the question of how to gather public comment on all projects at some point in the future.

**Resolution 2010-03 moved by: Daubert and seconded by: Parsons**  
**Resolution APPROVED as amended**

#### Factors for Considering Major Scope Changes – Acquisition Projects

Policy Specialist Dominga Soliz reviewed the staff recommendation and stakeholder feedback about factors that the board may consider when approving major scope changes for acquisition projects. Staff will propose the same factors to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.

Board members discussed how to balance the needs for fairness in the process with the board's need for flexibility. Board member Parsons noted that the factors are not equivalent to criteria and that a standard package of information would be collected to give them information before considering the factors. He noted that their decisions set precedent, and that it will be important to track their decisions so they are consistent.

Board member Saunders proposed the following changes to attachment A:

- Change "may" to "shall"
- Change last sentence to "Sponsors and their outdoor grants manager shall provide..."

The board determined that a formal amendment was not needed to change the attachment. The sixth paragraph of the resolution was changed to add "as amended" after the word "policy."

**Resolution 2010-04 moved by: Parsons and seconded by: Spanel**  
**Resolution APPROVED as amended.**

#### Policy Changes to WWRP Farmland Preservation Program

Policy Specialist Dominga Soliz reviewed the staff recommendation and stakeholder feedback about proposed policy changes to (1) revise the environmental values evaluation criteria, (2) exclude community gardens from program eligibility, and (3) update the program definition of "farm and agricultural land." Staff would look at the criteria for equestrian activities later this year.

In response to questions from board member Drew, Dominga described the outreach with the Puget Sound Partnership and the State Conservation Commission. The board noted that

the language is an improvement, and a step in the right direction. Board member Parsons moved to adopt the portion of the resolution related to environmental criteria. Board member Saunders seconded. Both members later withdrew the motion.

Although board members agreed that community gardens have great value, the board debated whether they should be eligible in the farmland preservation program, with the discussion focused on the following questions:

- What is the definition of a “community garden”?
- How do community gardens relate to the program intent to preserve a critical mass of farmland in some areas?
- Does the size and scale of a community garden make a difference for eligibility?
- How should the board consider the role of community gardens in some communities, as a primary source of local produce?
- Could the board address community gardens through program criteria rather than through eligibility?

The board asked staff to provide them with a list of RCO grant programs that currently fund community gardens at the June meeting. The board also supported the staff intent to develop policies related to equestrian-related activities in the farmland program. Staff should report on progress and/or policy recommendations in October.

Board member Parson moved adoption of resolution with the exclusion of the first bullet under paragraph seven and any other text in the resolution related to community gardens. Board member Drew seconded.

**Resolution 2010-05 moved by: Parsons and seconded by: Drew**  
**Resolution APPROVED as amended.**

#### Revised Evaluation Criteria for Land and Water Conservation Fund

Policy Specialist Jim Eychaner reviewed the staff recommendation and stakeholder feedback about a revised evaluation instrument (“priority rating system”) for the Land and Water Conservation Fund grant program. The revision would add a design question for development projects and an urgency/viability question for acquisitions. Combination projects would respond to both.

**Resolution 2010-06 moved by: Parsons and seconded by: Daubert**  
**Resolution APPROVED**



### Policy Regarding Nonprofit Eligibility in WWRP

Policy Specialist Jim Eychaner reviewed the staff recommendation and stakeholder feedback regarding a policy change to allow nonprofit organizations to be eligible sponsors in the WWRP Riparian and Farmland categories.

**Resolution 2010-07 moved by: Drew                      and seconded by: Derr**  
**Resolution APPROVED**

## **Briefings**

### Incorporating Sustainability into RCO Grant Programs

Jim Eychaner summarized his research into possible approaches for incorporating sustainability into RCO grant programs, and asked for board guidance on next steps. Jim also noted a new PRISM metric that asks about the sustainable practices currently being used. The data will inform checklists and guidelines for programs.

The board discussed several aspects of sustainability, using the white paper summary as a guide. Key themes of the discussion were as follows:

- Lower maintenance and energy costs in parks can lead to economic sustainability, but some approaches may fall into “gray areas” of environmental sustainability.
- Long-term needs for maintenance and operations are linked to sustainability. Project criteria could consider how sponsors will address long-term maintenance. Such criteria, however, can be difficult to evaluate, score, and measure.
- The approaches to sustainability manifest differently in each program. Members and staff discussed examples of habitat conservation and managed recreation as demonstrating how projects can be sustainable in very different ways.
- The board strongly favors incentives over requirements. Rewarding sustainability may lead the board to funding fewer projects because sustainable practices can be more costly. However, the board wants to be cautious that it does not give extra points for approaches that are sustainable but overly expensive or too experimental.
- Staff should consider the approaches to sustainability being used by other state agencies. Coordination and consistency are important.

Board members agreed that sustainability cannot be addressed universally across all programs. They discussed priority by project type, in particular, development versus renovation.

Summary of board direction:

- Staff should provide a process and timeline for developing criteria for the following WWRP categories, beginning with the next grant round: State Parks, State Lands Restoration, Local Parks, and Trails.
- The process should consider how to work with other boards, and integrate with other policy updates/reviews of incentives where it can be efficiently combined.
- Staff should confer with experts and stakeholders in developing the proposals, but should not establish a standing committee. Informal workshops are an acceptable alternative.
- Staff should consider a discussion with the Parks Commission in June regarding sustainability.

State Agency Partner Reports

Board member Saunders noted that DNR was successful in getting biomass energy bill signed. Timber prices are starting to go back up, and they have been successful in predicting the types that are needed on the market.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.**

Approved by:

---

Bill Chapman, Chair

---

Date

**Item 2A**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Director's Report  
Prepared By: Kaleen Cottingham, Director

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing****Summary****RTP Funding Made Available**

RCO just received word that the Federal Highways Administration has released the rest of the funding for the Recreational Trails Program. Earlier this year, 10 projects were funded. Now, Washington will receive another \$1.4 million more for trail projects. The funding will be applied to projects approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board in 2009. RCO expects to offer funding to about 25 general and 11 education projects.

**Grant Recipient Has Vision**

The Puget Sound Regional Council recognized a Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program farmland project with a VISION 2040 Award during a May dinner in Seattle. I would like to thank Bill Chapman for attending to represent the board. Pierce County used a \$750,000 WWRP – farmland grant to protect the 100-acre Orting Valley Farm. The grant purchased conservation easements that prevent development and allowed five farmers to establish working farms there. The Puyallup River valley, and this farm in particular, are facing increasing pressure to develop.

**National Park Service Programmatic Review**

The National Park Service will review RCO's administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund grant program the week of November 15 – 19. A small team of national park staff will randomly select project files to review for program compliance; key state comprehensive recreation plan eligibility items; our application intake, review, and evaluation process; program staffing levels; grant obligation and expenditure rates; RCO's coordination with the state historic preservation office; and our inspection and compliance program, to name a few. In some ways, the review already has begun. Last week, the National Park Service notified us of two acquisition projects for which they will have the appraisal and appraisal reviews audited by their staff. Several RCO staff will be involved in preparing and participating for the review across nearly all of RCO's work units. Much of which will take place here in the office, but some site inspections also will occur to verify RCO inspections.

## Manuals Simplified

In an effort to make our grant process easier for sponsors, a team of staff started revising the manuals. Staff updated the manuals to include recent board policy decisions, simplified and standardized the text across manuals, and redesigned the look to make them easier to read. In all, six manuals were redone for the recreation and conservation grant round this year with a seventh receiving just a redesign. The work resulted in more than 9,500 words being eliminated.

## NOVA Lawsuit Continues

Last October, the Washington Off-Highway Vehicle Alliance and others sued the state Treasurer and the State Parks and Recreation Commission claiming that a 2009 law unlawfully ordered the transfer of off-road vehicle (ORV) fees and gasoline taxes from the state's Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) and Boating Facilities Programs (Recreation Resources Account). In part, the petition alleged that \$9.5 million was given to State Parks for purposes that would not benefit the recreating ORV public as required by law. In March, the Thurston County superior court ruled in favor of the state. Earlier this month, we received notice that the off-road vehicle plaintiffs are appealing.

## Updated PRISM Launched Successfully in March

In March, RCO launched one of the biggest changes to the agency's core database, PRISM, in many years; changes that affect every grant applicant. The changes will allow RCO to collect more information about how grants are being invested and what we are achieving with that investment. The information will help us, and our sponsors, better tell the story of why this funding is important. The changes were in the types of questions we ask grant applicants. The questions vary by grant program and project type and include questions such as: How many jobs will be created by this grant? How many ball fields will be developed? How many miles of stream will be restored? How many endangered species will be protected? With this information, RCO will not only be able to say how many grants were awarded but what they accomplished. Before now, that information required a manual search through all grant records.

## Streamlining Grants and Loans

RCO is leading an interagency committee to look at ways that natural resource grant and loan services and information could be streamlined to make it easier for the public. The effort is part of the Governor's natural resources reform initiative. The committee held its first meeting in May and agreed on five actions to explore:

1. Provide grant and loan information in one place on the Web, supporting the "one front door" initiative. This initiative will have a portal for natural resources information accessible through the Access Washington Web site.
2. Allow grant recipients to register online with the Office of Financial Management's proposed vendor registration program so that they don't have to fill in basic information every time they apply for a grant.

3. Assess whether to move any grant or loan program to different agencies to better align service.
4. Create basic information on all grant and loan programs so that we all know what programs are offered throughout the state and can direct applicants to the best program for their needs.
5. Formalize the grant and loan managers work group with a charter aimed at sharing best grant management practices at periodic meetings.

## **Audit Results Are In – Three Areas to Improve**

RCO recently received the conclusions from the State Auditor's Office for the 2007, 2008, and 2009 accountability audit. Unfortunately there were three issues that we must address. One of those is considered an audit "finding," the most serious category for auditors. The auditor found that RCO does not sufficiently monitor grant recipients to make sure that they are spending money the way they say on their invoices. An earlier federal audit found the same issue for our federal salmon funds and recommended that RCO require backup documentation and review it before paying bills. Rather than require all grant recipients to submit all invoice records, RCO has developed a risk-based sponsor profile that will guide our monitoring of invoices. RCO has started doing this for some salmon sponsors and will decide what changes to make in other grant programs as a result of this audit finding. Starting April 1, salmon sponsors who scored higher on the risk analysis are required to provide copies of backup documents, such as invoices, timesheets, and receipts, with their invoices to us.

For the second issue, the auditor found several instances when we did not follow, or did not document following, state contracting policy for personal service contracts. We had already identified a need to have one person be our contracting specialist and have assigned a staff person to that role. The third issue, the auditor found that we did not have an appropriate system to assure that payroll staff did not enter their own leave into the personnel system. RCO had set up a process to check this but the auditor felt it wasn't enough. Because the Small Agency Client Services in the Office of Financial Management will now be handling leave reporting, this will no longer be a problem.

## **RCO Welcomes New Staff**

- Tammy Dotson started June 1 as one of our fiscal staff. She comes to RCO with several years of great experience at several different agencies. She has worked at the Liquor Control Board, Department of Ecology, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife.
- Three summer interns: Tristan Vaughn (The Evergreen State College student), Jeff Cedarbaum (Western Washington University student) and Nic McDonald (Whitman College student) will intern with RCO this summer. Their time will be spent inspecting projects, focusing on Land and Water Conservation Fund projects. They will be filling any gaps with other helpful things, such as mapping old acquisition projects.
- Lori Lawrence, who worked with the Biodiversity Council in 2007–2008, has re-joined the council as a temporary, part-time project associate. Lori was instrumental in the planning

and execution of the successful biodiversity conference in 2007 and the salmon conference in 2009.

- Jennifer Johnson has joined the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office as the new recovery implementation coordinator. Jennifer will be working on the State of Salmon Report, developing systems to track statewide progress in implementing salmon recovery plans, and the Habitat Work Schedule. She has more than six years of experience working with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service as a project coordinator, permit analyst, and Northwest Region coordinator for the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund.

## **Meeting Northwest Marine Trade Association's New President**

During March, I had the opportunity to meet with the new president of the Northwest Marine Trade Association and key staff. This is an important ally on our boating programs and we strive to maintain a good working relationship with them. We talked about the ongoing programmatic audit of the state's boating funding and expenditures being done by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee, scheduled to be completed next fall, and how we might coordinate to use that information next legislative session.

## **Board Updates**

### **Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB)**

At its May meeting, the SRFB adopted a new policy for approving major scope changes for acquisition projects. This is the same policy that the RCFB adopted in March. The SRFB also extended funding for several monitoring programs, pending receipt of federal funding. SRFB staff have been busy reviewing projects for board funding decisions in December. They also have been bringing in the money. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Northwest Regional Office has asked RCO to manage eight contracts for work to implement the Pacific Salmon Treaty for Puget Sound Chinook critical stock augmentation. RCO will receive \$3.9 million for grants and administration. In addition, the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife has asked RCO to administer three projects worth \$3.3 million that were included recently in the supplemental capital budget.

### **Washington Biodiversity Council**

For the council, it has been a classic good news/bad news scenario. The good news was that a meeting of the council's state agency representatives reaffirmed the importance of the role the council has played to help conserve Washington's biodiversity. The bad news was that later the same day, the Governor vetoed language in the budget that would have extended the council for another year. In her veto message, the Governor asked the Natural Resources Cabinet to absorb the council's oversight role. At its meeting in late May, the Natural Resources cabinet opted to distribute various elements of the council's strategy and projects to different state agencies rather than merging the council into another entity. This transition will occur over the next fiscal year. The council's last meeting was June 3. The agenda included presentations on two council projects that are nearing completion: Refining a catalogue of conservation tools for

land use planners, and developing a communication piece to summarize the work on the Biodiversity Scorecard.

### Washington Invasive Species Council

In March, the council worked with partner agencies to flush Capitol Lake with saltwater to kill the invading New Zealand mud snail. Despite hard work, the efforts were not successful, killing only 12 percent of the snails. The council is working with the Department of Ecology to survey water bodies around Capitol Lake to assess the extent of the mud snail infestation in Puget Sound. That work will occur over the summer. In other business, the council's contractors have developed a database containing information on 15 priority invasive species in the Puget Sound area. The database contains information such as what species are located in each county, which agency is managing each species, and what is known about each species. This database will be part of the council's information clearinghouse. At its May meeting, the council agreed to work towards extending itself past its 2011 sunset and creating an emergency invasive species fund. The council also has coordinated with Oregon and Idaho on a successful grant application to educate citizens about the need to stop moving firewood from one area to another due because of the high potential to move invasive pests.

### Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group

The lands group is working to publish the first Biennial State Land Acquisition Forecast in June. The forecast will include a report and statewide map of potential land purchases by state agencies in the 2011-2013 biennium. It also will include information about areas in which the Department of Transportation needs to find wetland mitigation sites to purchase as well as information about properties for transfer in the Department of Natural Resources' Trust Land Transfer program. The final report and companion map will be posted on the lands group Web site.

### Washington Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health

The forum is co-hosting a series of meetings to develop recommendations for a Pacific Northwest, multi-agency strategy for habitat effectiveness monitoring. The meetings will help different agencies begin to work through policy and technical issues to align different effectiveness monitoring programs. This work will feed aid the forum's process to recommend protocols for monitoring its high level indicators of salmon recovery and watershed health. The forum also is working on a strategy and draft legislation to extend itself past its 2011 expiration date.

### Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO)

GSRO revised its guidance manual for regional organizations and lead entities as well as the scope of work for lead entity grant agreements. The revised grant agreements will improve the alignment of lead entities with the SRFB's process for funding habitat projects. GSRO also hired Evergreen Funding Consultants to develop a long-term state and regional funding strategy for implementing salmon recovery plans.

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board - Activities by Program**

For the Period of July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2011, actuals through 05/28/2010 (05/28/10 fm 11)

Percentage of biennium reported: 45.8%

	<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>COMMITTED</b>		<b>TO BE COMMITTED</b>		<b>EXPENDITURES</b>	
	<b>new &amp; reapp. 2009-11</b>	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>% of budget</b>	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>% of budget</b>	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>% of committed</b>
<b>Grant Programs</b>							
<b>WA Wildlife &amp; Rec. Program (WWRP)</b>							
WWRP Reappropriations	\$70,118,208	\$69,534,618	99%	\$583,590	0.8%	\$17,462,918	25.1%
WWRP New 09-11 Funds	\$67,900,000	\$67,552,790	99%	\$347,210	0.51%	\$13,001,079	19.2%
<b>Boating Facilities Program (BFP)</b>							
BFP Reappropriations	5,673,203	5,673,203	100%	0	0.0%	3,384,940	59.7%
<b>Nonhighway &amp; Off-Road Vehicle (NOVA)</b>							
NOVA Reappropriations	7,818,302	7,506,310	96%	311,992	4.0%	3,377,246	45.0%
<b>Land &amp; Water Conserv. Fund (LWCF)</b>							
LWCF Reappropriations	1,583,505	1,583,505	100%	0	0%	90,498	5.7%
LWCF New 09-11 Funds	1,632,330	1,632,330	100%	0	0%	2,722	0.2%
<b>Aquatic Lands Enhan. Account (ALEA)</b>							
ALEA Reappropriations	3,906,470	3,906,470	100%	0	0.0%	850,341	21.8%
ALEA New 09-11 Funds	5,567,754	5,567,754	100%	0	0.0%	2,076,638	37.3%
<b>Recreational Trails Program (RTP)</b>							
RTP Reappropriations	4,975,141	4,975,141	100%	0	0.0%	1,718,816	34.5%
RTP New 09-11 Funds	820,000	820,000	100%	0	0.0%	206,945	25.2%
<b>Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF)</b>							
YAF Reappropriations	1,735,796	1,604,715	92%	131,081	7.6%	558,614	34.8%
<b>Firearms &amp; Archery Range Rec (FARR)</b>							
FARR Reappropriations	430,199	270,072	63%	160,127	37%	88,285	32.7%
FARR New 09-11 Funds	495,000	352,421	71%	142,579	29%	110,445	31.3%
<b>Boating Infrastructure Grants (BIG)</b>							
BIG Reappropriations	186,498	186,498	100%	0	0%	17,998	9.7%
BIG New 09-11 Funds	750,000	750,000	100%	0	0%	0	0.0%
Sub Total Grant Programs	173,592,406	171,915,827	99%	1,676,579	1%	42,947,485	25.0%
<b>Administration</b>							
General Operating Funds	6,578,871	6,578,871	100%	0	0%	2,688,557	40.9%
<b>Grant and Administration Total</b>	<b>\$180,171,276</b>	<b>\$178,494,698</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>\$1,676,578</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$45,636,041</b>	<b>25.6%</b>

Note: The budget column shows the state appropriations and any received federal awards.




## Recreation and Conservation Office – Entire Agency Summary by Board

2009-11 Budget Status Report, Capital + Operating the Agency

For the Period of July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2011, actuals through 5/28/10 (fm11)

Percentage of biennium reported: 45.8%

	BUDGET			COMMITTED		TO BE COMMITTED		EXPENDITURES	
	New	Reapp.	new and reapp. 2009-2011	Dollars	% of budget	Dollars	% of budget	Dollars	% of committed
<b>Board/Program</b>									
RCFB	\$81,363,955	\$98,807,321	180,171,276	\$178,494,698	99%	\$1,676,578	0.93%	\$45,636,041	26%
SRFB	144,669,317	39,205,482	183,874,799	172,270,287	94%	11,604,513	6.31%	38,195,972	22%
Hatchery Reform	-	18,849	18,849	18,849	100%	0	0.00%	18,849	100%
Biodiversity Council	400,000	-	400,000	400,000	100%	0	0.00%	207,089	52%
invasive Species	421,000	-	421,000	421,000	100%	0	0.00%	155,542	37%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$226,854,272</b>	<b>\$138,031,652</b>	<b>\$364,885,924</b>	<b>\$351,604,834</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>\$13,281,091</b>	<b>3.64%</b>	<b>\$84,213,493</b>	<b>24%</b>





## Recreation and Conservation Funding Board – Revenue Report

2009-11 Budget Status Report - Revenues

For the Period of July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2011, actuals through 4/30/2010 (fm 10)

Percentage of biennium reported: 42%

Revenue	Bienial Forecast Estimate	Collections	
		Actual	% of Estimate
Boating Facilities Program (BFP)	\$11,847,200	\$4,662,518	39%
Nonhighway, Off-Road Vehicle Program (NOVA)	9,895,719	3,820,891	39%
Firearms and Archery Range Rec Program (FARR)	352,110	164,226	47%
Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF)	14,154	5,084	36%
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,109,183</b>	<b>8,652,719</b>	<b>39%</b>



### Revenue Notes:

Boating Facilities Program (BFP) revenue is from the unrefunded marine gasoline taxes.

Nonhighway, Off-Road Vehicle Program (NOVA) revenue is from the motor vehicle gasoline tax paid by users of ORVs and nonhighway roads and from the amount paid for by ORV use permits.

Firearms and Archery Range Rec Program (FARR) revenue is from \$3 each concealed pistol license fee.

Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) revenue is from an initial \$10 million contribution by the Seattle Seahawks "team affiliate" in 1998. The new revenue is from the interest on the unexpended amount of the fund.

This reflects the most recent revenue forecast of February 2010. The next forecast is due in June 2010.

## RCFB – Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Summary

1990 Through May 28, 2010

### History of Biennial Appropriations

Biennium	Appropriation
89-91 Biennium	\$53,000,000
91-93 Biennium	61,150,000
93-95 Biennium	65,000,000
95-97 Biennium*	43,760,000
97-99 Biennium	45,000,000
99-01 Biennium	48,000,000
01-03 Biennium	45,000,000
03-05 Biennium	45,000,000
05-07 Biennium **	48,500,000
07-09 Biennium ***	96,019,000
09-11 Biennium ****	67,900,000
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$618,329,000</b>

#### Notes to History of Biennial Appropriations:

\* Original appropriation was \$45 million.

\*\* Entire appropriation was \$50 million.

3% (\$1,500,000) went to admin.

\*\*\* Entire appropriation was \$100 million.

3% (\$3,000,000) went to admin. Removed \$981,000 with FY 10 supplemental.


\*\*\*\* Entire appropriation was \$70 million.

3% (\$2,100,000) went to admin.

### History of Committed and Expenditures

Agency	Committed	Expenditures	% Expended
Local Agencies	\$235,409,898	\$198,112,666	84%
Conservation Commission	\$383,178	\$173,178	45%
State Parks	\$108,117,880	\$90,143,634	83%
Fish & Wildlife	\$147,747,397	\$129,641,482	88%
Natural Resources	\$125,004,836	\$91,843,340	73%
Riparian Habitat Admin	\$185,046	\$185,046	100%
Land Inventory (\$169k for SSB 6242)	\$549,965	\$549,965	100%
<b>Sub Total Committed</b>	<b>\$617,398,200</b>	<b>\$510,649,310</b>	<b>83%</b>

#### Committed and Expended Funds



**Item 2B**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Fiscal Report  
Prepared By: Mark Jarasitis, Chief Financial Officer

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

## Summary

The attached financial reports reflect Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB) activities as of May 31, 2010.

- Attachment A reflects the budget status of RCFB activities by program. The Washington Wildlife Recreation Program (WWRP) program is \$137,087,408 committed. The remaining \$930,800 will be committed by assigning returned funding to alternate projects.
- Attachment B reflects the budget status of the entire agency by board.
- Attachment C reflects the revenue collections. The revenue spreadsheet reflects the most recent revenue forecasts as of February 2010 for the 2009-11 biennium. There were decreases in the projected revenue collections for the Boating Facilities Program (BFP) and the Nonhighway, Off-Road Vehicle Program (NOVA). RCO is contacting the other agencies with budgeted amounts in these funds. Reductions will be necessary.
- Attachment D is a Washington Wildlife Recreation Program (WWRP) summary. Since the beginning of this program, \$510,649,310 of funds appropriated in the WWRP program have been spent or accrued. The report also reflects a \$981,000 reduction to WWRP from the 2010 state supplemental budget.

If you have any questions on the materials, please call Mark Jarasitis at (360) 902-3006 or inquire at the meeting.

## Attachments

- A. Recreation and Conservation Funding Board - Activities by Program
- B. Recreation and Conservation Office – Entire Agency Summary by Board
- C. Recreation and Conservation Funding Board – Revenue Report
- D. Recreation and Conservation Funding Board – Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Summary

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board - Activities by Program**

For the Period of July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2011, actuals through 05/28/2010 (05/28/10 fm 11)

Percentage of biennium reported: 45.8%

	<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>COMMITTED</b>		<b>TO BE COMMITTED</b>		<b>EXPENDITURES</b>	
	<b>new &amp; reapp. 2009-11</b>	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>% of budget</b>	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>% of budget</b>	<b>Dollars</b>	<b>% of committed</b>
<b>Grant Programs</b>							
<b>WA Wildlife &amp; Rec. Program (WWRP)</b>							
WWRP Reappropriations	\$70,118,208	\$69,534,618	99%	\$583,590	0.8%	\$17,462,918	25.1%
WWRP New 09-11 Funds	\$67,900,000	\$67,552,790	99%	\$347,210	0.51%	\$13,001,079	19.2%
<b>Boating Facilities Program (BFP)</b>							
BFP Reappropriations	5,673,203	5,673,203	100%	0	0.0%	3,384,940	59.7%
<b>Nonhighway &amp; Off-Road Vehicle (NOVA)</b>							
NOVA Reappropriations	7,818,302	7,506,310	96%	311,992	4.0%	3,377,246	45.0%
<b>Land &amp; Water Conserv. Fund (LWCF)</b>							
LWCF Reappropriations	1,583,505	1,583,505	100%	0	0%	90,498	5.7%
LWCF New 09-11 Funds	1,632,330	1,632,330	100%	0	0%	2,722	0.2%
<b>Aquatic Lands Enhan. Account (ALEA)</b>							
ALEA Reappropriations	3,906,470	3,906,470	100%	0	0.0%	850,341	21.8%
ALEA New 09-11 Funds	5,567,754	5,567,754	100%	0	0.0%	2,076,638	37.3%
<b>Recreational Trails Program (RTP)</b>							
RTP Reappropriations	4,975,141	4,975,141	100%	0	0.0%	1,718,816	34.5%
RTP New 09-11 Funds	820,000	820,000	100%	0	0.0%	206,945	25.2%
<b>Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF)</b>							
YAF Reappropriations	1,735,796	1,604,715	92%	131,081	7.6%	558,614	34.8%
<b>Firearms &amp; Archery Range Rec (FARR)</b>							
FARR Reappropriations	430,199	270,072	63%	160,127	37%	88,285	32.7%
FARR New 09-11 Funds	495,000	352,421	71%	142,579	29%	110,445	31.3%
<b>Boating Infrastructure Grants (BIG)</b>							
BIG Reappropriations	186,498	186,498	100%	0	0%	17,998	9.7%
BIG New 09-11 Funds	750,000	750,000	100%	0	0%	0	0.0%
Sub Total Grant Programs	173,592,406	171,915,827	99%	1,676,579	1%	42,947,485	25.0%
<b>Administration</b>							
General Operating Funds	6,578,871	6,578,871	100%	0	0%	2,688,557	40.9%
<b>Grant and Administration Total</b>	<b>\$180,171,276</b>	<b>\$178,494,698</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>\$1,676,578</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>\$45,636,041</b>	<b>25.6%</b>

Note: The budget column shows the state appropriations and any received federal awards.


## Recreation and Conservation Office – Entire Agency Summary by Board

2009-11 Budget Status Report, Capital + Operating the Agency

For the Period of July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2011, actuals through 5/28/10 (fm11)

Percentage of biennium reported: 45.8%

	BUDGET			COMMITTED		TO BE COMMITTED		EXPENDITURES	
	New	Reapp.	new and reapp. 2009-2011	Dollars	% of budget	Dollars	% of budget	Dollars	% of committed
<b>Board/Program</b>									
RCFB	\$81,363,955	\$98,807,321	180,171,276	\$178,494,698	99%	\$1,676,578	0.93%	\$45,636,041	26%
SRFB	144,669,317	39,205,482	183,874,799	172,270,287	94%	11,604,513	6.31%	38,195,972	22%
Hatchery Reform	-	18,849	18,849	18,849	100%	0	0.00%	18,849	100%
Biodiversity Council	400,000	-	400,000	400,000	100%	0	0.00%	207,089	52%
invasive Species	421,000	-	421,000	421,000	100%	0	0.00%	155,542	37%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$226,854,272</b>	<b>\$138,031,652</b>	<b>\$364,885,924</b>	<b>\$351,604,834</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>\$13,281,091</b>	<b>3.64%</b>	<b>\$84,213,493</b>	<b>24%</b>





## Recreation and Conservation Funding Board – Revenue Report

2009-11 Budget Status Report - Revenues

For the Period of July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2011, actuals through 4/30/2010 (fm 10)

Percentage of biennium reported: 42%

Revenue	Bienial Forecast Estimate	Collections	
		Actual	% of Estimate
Boating Facilities Program (BFP)	\$11,847,200	\$4,662,518	39%
Nonhighway, Off-Road Vehicle Program (NOVA)	9,895,719	3,820,891	39%
Firearms and Archery Range Rec Program (FARR)	352,110	164,226	47%
Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF)	14,154	5,084	36%
<b>Total</b>	<b>22,109,183</b>	<b>8,652,719</b>	<b>39%</b>



### Revenue Notes:

Boating Facilities Program (BFP) revenue is from the unrefunded marine gasoline taxes.

Nonhighway, Off-Road Vehicle Program (NOVA) revenue is from the motor vehicle gasoline tax paid by users of ORVs and nonhighway roads and from the amount paid for by ORV use permits.

Firearms and Archery Range Rec Program (FARR) revenue is from \$3 each concealed pistol license fee.

Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) revenue is from an initial \$10 million contribution by the Seattle Seahawks "team affiliate" in 1998. The new revenue is from the interest on the unexpended amount of the fund.

This reflects the most recent revenue forecast of February 2010. The next forecast is due in June 2010.

## RCFB – Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Summary

1990 Through May 28, 2010

### History of Biennial Appropriations

Biennium	Appropriation
89-91 Biennium	\$53,000,000
91-93 Biennium	61,150,000
93-95 Biennium	65,000,000
95-97 Biennium*	43,760,000
97-99 Biennium	45,000,000
99-01 Biennium	48,000,000
01-03 Biennium	45,000,000
03-05 Biennium	45,000,000
05-07 Biennium **	48,500,000
07-09 Biennium ***	96,019,000
09-11 Biennium ****	67,900,000
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$618,329,000</b>

#### Notes to History of Biennial Appropriations:

\* Original appropriation was \$45 million.

\*\* Entire appropriation was \$50 million.

3% (\$1,500,000) went to admin.

\*\*\* Entire appropriation was \$100 million.

3% (\$3,000,000) went to admin. Removed \$981,000 with FY 10 supplemental.


\*\*\*\* Entire appropriation was \$70 million.

3% (\$2,100,000) went to admin.

### History of Committed and Expenditures

Agency	Committed	Expenditures	% Expended
Local Agencies	\$235,409,898	\$198,112,666	84%
Conservation Commission	\$383,178	\$173,178	45%
State Parks	\$108,117,880	\$90,143,634	83%
Fish & Wildlife	\$147,747,397	\$129,641,482	88%
Natural Resources	\$125,004,836	\$91,843,340	73%
Riparian Habitat Admin	\$185,046	\$185,046	100%
Land Inventory (\$169k for SSB 6242)	\$549,965	\$549,965	100%
<b>Sub Total Committed</b>	<b>\$617,398,200</b>	<b>\$510,649,310</b>	<b>83%</b>

#### Committed and Expended Funds





**Item 2C**

Meeting Date: June 2010

Title: Summary of 2010 Supplemental Budget Impacts/Other Legislation

Prepared By: Steve McLellan, Policy Director

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

## Summary

The special legislative session adjourned on April 12 after passage of operating and capital budgets and a revenue package. The Governor signed the budgets on May 4. This memo provides a review of the legislative session and supplemental budget impacts.

## Supplemental Budget

The **operating budget** includes a higher funding level than was proposed in the Governor's budget. The legislature's budget keeps general fund appropriations for the natural resources data portal and for the Biodiversity Council. However, the Governor vetoed a proviso that would have extended the Biodiversity Council for a year, saying that the Council's oversight role would be absorbed by the Natural Resources Cabinet.

The **capital budget** included small reductions to Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) reappropriation and to the farmlands program. Those reductions can be accommodated without having to terminate any existing contracts.

- There also is a provision in the capital budget that the Office of Financial Management (OFM) will work with agencies to identify \$50 million in savings from projects that have not made "substantial progress" by November 30, 2010. Substantial progress means that we have taken all steps needed to execute a contract. This provision should not affect any projects funded by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board).

The legislature also directed agencies to reduce compensation expenditures or temporary layoffs of employees for ten days over the remainder of the biennium. Based on guidance from OFM, Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) will be closed on the following ten days. No board meetings need to be rescheduled because of temporary layoff-related closures.

- Monday July 12, 2010
- Friday August 6, 2010
- Tuesday Sept 7, 2010

- Monday Oct 11, 2010
- Monday Dec 27, 2010
- Friday Jan 28, 2011
- Tuesday Feb 22, 2011
- Friday Mar 11, 2011
- Friday April 22, 2011
- Friday June 10, 2011

The levels included in RCO's budget to reflect the temporary layoffs are incorrect. RCO staff will work with OFM as part of the supplemental budget process to make needed changes during the next legislative session.

## **Boards and Commissions Bill**

The legislature approved elimination of over 40 boards and commissions. No RCO-related boards were included on the list.

The legislature also approved restrictions on state board and commission travel reimbursements, effective July 1, 2010. Although the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board is not included in these restrictions because of its fund source, it does fall under another provision in the bill that encourages boards to (1) use alternate formats for meetings (e.g., web-based meetings), (2) reduce travel expenses wherever possible, and (3) use only state-owned facilities (with limited exceptions).

## **Interim Studies**

The legislature did not assign any studies to RCO during this session. Nevertheless, we expect to be involved in a study led by the Joint Transportation Committee of the fuel tax refund for non-highway uses. The tax refund has provided major funding for some RCO grant programs and a substantial portion of agency administrative costs.

The initial Senate capital budget proposal directed a study of the agency's reappropriation rate. Although this study was not included in the final capital budget, we expect this to be a subject of legislative interest over the interim.

## **Natural Resources Reform**

- Bills tied to the Governor's natural resources reform effort to consolidate three Growth Management Hearing Boards into one and to streamline environmental appeals both were successful.
- Bills to merge the Pollution Liability Insurance Agency into the Department of Ecology, to allow Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) to enforce Department of Natural Resources (DNR) regulations, and to streamline (and establish fees for) the hydraulic permit process died.

- A major proposal (not part of the Governor's package) to merge State Parks and DFW into DNR died in committee, but was part of the initial Senate budget proposal. The final spending plan did not include the merger language, but directed DFW and DNR to consolidate land management functions and find savings from consolidating facilities. Another section of the budget also directs OFM to seek savings from consolidation of natural resource agency facilities where possible.

## **Other Bills of Interest**

The Governor signed SB 6520, Agricultural/Forest Incentives, granting the Ruckelshaus Center an additional year to negotiate voluntary landowner incentives for agriculture and place a moratorium on counties updating Critical Area Ordinances. The Governor also signed HB 2541, which directs DNR to study voluntary incentives for improved environmental practices. The study must be completed by the end of 2011. Bills to require agriculture impact statements for land acquisitions and to increase consideration of agriculture in SEPA reviews both failed to pass.

Other Natural Resource related bills/proposals: A bill to establish a fee to fund the Natural Heritage program at DNR failed, but the program received a small general fund appropriation in the final budget. The DNR proposal to implement portions of its Sustainable Recreation workgroup recommendations died in the Senate. Also, a number of bills were introduced to restrict DFW land acquisitions. Although they did not move forward, the topic is expected to remain on the agenda over the interim and next session.

**Item 2D**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Recreation and Conservation Grants Management Report  
Prepared By: Scott Robinson and Marguerite Austin, Section Managers

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

## Grant Cycles

### 2010 Grants Cycle

As of May 20, 2010 the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) had received 445 project applications requesting about \$226 million in the following categories:

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA)	35 projects	\$13 million
Boating Infrastructure Grants (BIG)	9 projects	\$10 million
Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)	19 projects	\$5.9 million
Recreational Trails Program (RTP)	103 projects	\$4.3 million
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)		
Habitat Conservation Account		
Critical Habitat	11 projects	\$25 million
Natural Areas	12 projects	\$22 million
State Lands Restoration	17 projects	\$4.1 million
Urban Wildlife Habitat	19 projects	\$22.5 million
Farmland Preservation Account	25 projects	\$14.4 million
Outdoor Recreation Account		
Local Parks	84 projects	\$30.8 million
State Land Development	17 projects	\$4.5 million
State Parks	12 projects	\$12 million
Trails	39 projects	\$23.7 million
Water Access	18 projects	\$9.4 million
Riparian Protection Account	25 projects	\$23.9 million

## Alternate Projects Funded

In July 2009, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) approved the funding of 105 ALEA and WWRP projects worth about \$75 million. Most of those projects are now under agreement. In addition, RCO has been passing unspent funds from previous biennia to projects that were either partially funded or in alternate status ((see Attachment A for the current biennial list and Attachment B for prior biennia). In general, unspent funds become available for two reasons:

1. A project is unable to complete its scope of work and the funds come back to RCO to distribute, or
2. A project completes its scope of work under budget and a portion of the funds comes back to RCO to distribute.

As shown in the following table, the RCO has approved over \$10 million for alternate or partially funded projects.

<b>Program and Category</b>	<b>Amount Approved for Alternates or Partially Funded Projects</b>
<b>Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)</b>	<b>\$9,178,188</b>
Riparian Protection Account	\$1,408,000
Farmland Preservation Account	\$573,000
Outdoor Recreation Account	\$4,020,122
<i>Local Parks</i>	\$1,617,365
<i>State Lands Development</i>	\$90,000
<i>State Parks</i>	\$1,415,000
<i>Trails</i>	\$428,747
<i>Water Access</i>	\$469,010
Habitat Conservation Account	\$3,177,066
<i>Critical Habitat</i>	\$2,755,066
<i>State Lands Restoration</i>	\$422,000
<b>Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account, Fiscal Year 2010</b>	<b>\$1,312,834</b>

## Staff Activity

### Project Review

Project reviews will take place throughout the month of June. These reviews allow applicants the opportunity to present their projects and receive valuable feedback that will help them further prepare and be ready for evaluations in August. This year, RCO is offering applicants two methods of project review this year: (1) in-person presentations, at which the applicant presents

the project in front of the committee, and (2) via GoToMeeting, in which the applicant presents the project from their office through a computer network connection.

Staff is spending much of their time reviewing applications for technical and eligibility issues, visiting application project sites, and working with applicants to prepare and help them understand the grant process. We will provide an update of the review process at the June board meeting.

## Volunteer Recruitment

Staff also are recruiting volunteers to conduct project reviews and evaluations, and filling vacancies in many of our standing advisory committees. Our grant process is built around the willingness of others to share their time and expertise, so finding and scheduling volunteers is an essential part of the process.

## PRISM – final reports module

RCO staff is in the process of developing another significant PRISM module. The “final reports” module will allow applicants to submit their last project report via PRISM. Applicants also may enter final information as scope elements are completed. RCO implemented a similar “progress report” module last year, which applicants use to provide RCO status updates at various times throughout the project. RCO’s goal is to have the final report feature available by June 30, 2010.

## Conversions and Compliance

RCO staff met with the National Parks Service (NPS) in April to discuss Land and Water Conservation Funded sites with current compliance and conversion issues. Over the past year, RCO has made progress in this area by finalizing the Lynwood Athletic Fields conversion and completing ten other compliance issues. NPS asked the RCO to develop a prioritized list of compliance issues to work on over the next year. The top five issues RCO will focus on are:

- Fort Worden compliance issue- State Parks
- Grayland Beach conversion – State Parks
- Sullivan Park conversion – Everett Parks and Recreation Department
- Yakima River – Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Silverdale Waterfront Park- Kitsap County Parks and Recreation

## Project Administration

This table summarizes the outdoor recreation and habitat conservation projects administered by staff, as of June 9, 2010. Active projects are under agreement. Staff is working with sponsors to

place the "Board Funded" and "Director Approved" projects under agreement. In addition, staff has several hundred funded projects that they monitor for long-term compliance.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Active Projects</b>	<b>Board Funded Projects</b>	<b>Director Approved Projects</b>	<b>Total</b>
Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA)	22	0	2	<b>24</b>
Boating Facilities Program (BFP)	21	0	0	<b>21</b>
Boating Infrastructure Grant Program (BIG)	3	0	0	<b>3</b>
Firearms and Archery Range Recreation (FARR)	13	1	0	<b>14</b>
Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)	6	0	6	<b>12</b>
Recreational Trails Program (RTP)	36	37	0	<b>73</b>
Nonhighway and Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA)	76	0	0	<b>76</b>
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP)	188	4	5	<b>197</b>
Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF)	13	0	0	<b>13</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>433</b>

## Attachments

- A. FY 2010 WWRP and ALEA Alternate and Partially-Funded Projects Receiving Unspent Funds
- B. WWRP and ALEA Alternate Projects Receiving Unspent Funds, FY 2000 - 2009

## FY 2010 WWRP and ALEA Alternate Projects Funded

### Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP), Fiscal Year 2010

#### Riparian Protection Account

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
10 of 32	08-1183A	Stavis NRCA / Kitsap Forest NAP Riparian 2008	Dept of Natural Resources	\$3,423,052	\$133,000	\$1,408,000

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 22**

#### Farmland Preservation Account

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
12 of 14	08-1214C	Brown Dairy	Jefferson County of	\$395,290	\$95,047	<i>Declined funds</i>
13 of 14	08-1281A	Lopez Island Farmland	San Juan County Land Bank	\$300,000	Alternate	\$300,000
14 of 14	08-1289A	West Farm	Pierce County of	\$273,000	Alternate	\$273,000

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 0**

#### Outdoor Recreation Account

##### Local Parks

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
10 of 76	08-1091D	Wright Park Spray and Playground	Tacoma MPD	\$500,000	\$426,683	\$73,317
20 of 76	08-1390A	Tolle Anderson Park Acquisition	Issaquah City of	\$1,000,000	Alternate	\$1,000,000
22 of 76	08-1340D	Vashon Athletic Fields Improvements Ph 2 & 3	Vashon Park District	\$500,000	\$368,802	\$131,198
23 of 76	08-1209D	Lighthouse Park Phase 2	Mukilteo City of	\$500,000	Alternate	\$412,850

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 52**



### *State Lands Development*

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
5 of 13	08-1489D	Colockum Access Improvements	Dept of Fish & Wildlife	\$284,358	\$165,063	\$90,000

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 8**

### *State Parks*

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
2 of 11	08-1884A	Pearrygin Lake - Hill Acquisition	State Parks	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
5 of 11	08-1363A	Loomis Lake Acquisitions	State Parks	\$2,516,675	\$400,000	\$415,000

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 4**

### *Trails*

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
12 of 36	08-1298D	Mount Vernon Riverfront Promenade Trail	Mount Vernon City of	\$1,525,796	\$193,000	\$156,153
13 of 36	08-1262C	Sumner Trail #1 Confluence Trail to Bridge Street	Sumner City of	\$349,869	Alternate	\$272,594

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 24**

### *Water Access*

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
9 of 27	08-1587A	Lily Point Acquisition II	Whatcom County Parks & Rec	\$1,000,000	\$530,990	\$469,010

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 19**

## Habitat Conservation Account

### *Natural Areas and Urban Wildlife Habitat*

The Natural Areas and Urban Wildlife Habitat have no projects in alternate status that have received unspent funds.

- Total Natural Areas projects remaining in alternate status: 4
- Total Urban Wildlife Habitat projects remaining in alternate status: 10

### *Critical Habitat*

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
1 of 16	08-1504A	West Branch Little Spokane River Phase II	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	\$6,472,252	\$4,140,000	\$2,332,252
3 of 16	08-1502A	Okanogan Similkameen Phase 2	Fish & Wildlife Dept of	\$4,600,000	\$2,836,000	\$422,814

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 13**

### *State Lands Restoration*

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds Applied
13 of 21	08-1383R	Dabob Bay NAP Restoration Phase 1 (2008)	Dept of Natural Resources	\$330,000	\$19,122	\$310,878
14 of 21	08-1610R	Pogue Mountain Pre-commerical Thin	Dept of Fish & Wildlife	\$328,800	Alternate	\$111,122

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 7**

## **Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account, Fiscal Year 2010**

Rank	Number	Project Name	Project Sponsor	Request	Board Approved	Unspent Funds
4 of 22	08-1420A	Pt Heyer Drift Cell Preservation - Phase I ALEA	King Co Water & Land Res	\$600,000	Alternate*	\$51,387
13 of 22	08-1679D	Clover Island Improvement Project	Kennewick Port of	\$500,000	\$291,125**	\$208,875
14 of 22	08-1809D	Riverfront Trail Extension	Castle Rock City of	\$159,202	Alternate	\$159,202
15 of 22	08-1710R	North Wind's Weir Intertidal Restoration #1 ALEA	King Co Water & Land Res	\$500,000		\$312,680
16 of 22	08-1567D	Cusick Park River Enhancement	Cusick Town of	\$55,144		\$55,144
17 of 22	08-1633C	Westside Camano Acquisition (Henry Hollow)	Island County Planning Dept.	\$675,965		\$525,546

**Projects remaining in alternate status: 6**

\* Project 08-1420 was moved to alternate status after match certification.

\*\* Received partial funding when two projects (including 08-1420) were moved to alternate status after match certification.

## WWRP and ALEA Alternate Projects Receiving Unspent Funds, FY 2000 - 2009

Sixty alternate projects in the WWRP and ALEA grant programs received a more than \$33 million between fiscal years 2000 and 2009. Sixty percent are currently in closed completed status.

Program	Number	Name	Sponsor
<b>Aquatic Lands Enhancement Acct</b>			
	04-1483	Cap Sante Public Access Improvements	Anacortes Port of
	04-1502	Downtown Waterfront Access Restoration	Port Townsend City of
	06-1916	Scofield Estuary Park	Gig Harbor City of
<b>WWRP - Critical Habitat</b>			
	00-1332	Salmon & Snow Creek Estuary	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	02-1107	Sharp-tailed Grouse Phase 4	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	02-1110	Methow Watershed Phase 3	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	02-1143	Cowiche Watershed	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	02-1158	Upper Yakima River Acquisitions	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	02-1178	Hood Canal Plateau	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	02-1190	Asotin Creek Watershed	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	04-1283	Skookumchuck Watershed Phase 1	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
	06-1809	Okanogan-Similkameen Corridor	Fish & Wildlife Dept of
<b>WWRP - Farmland Preservation</b>			
	07-1556	Enumclaw Plateau Pasture Land	King County of
<b>WWRP - Local Parks</b>			
	01-1093	Squak Valley Park Expansion	Issaquah Parks & Rec Dept
	01-1180	Sunnyland Neighborhood Park Acq.	Bellingham Parks & Rec Dept
	02-1062	Maritime Park	Bremerton City of
	02-1146	Asotin Aquatic Center Development	Asotin County of
	03-1138	Hockinson Park	Vancouver Parks & Rec Dept
	03-1157	Renton Heritage Park Acquisition	Renton Parks Department
	04-1204	Lower Woodland Skate Park - Phase I	Seattle City of
	04-1383	North County Ballfields	Snohomish County Parks Dept
	04-1385	Hansen Park - Amenities & Development 04	Kennewick Parks & Rec Dept
	06-1570	Odlin Park Renovation - Phase II	San Juan County of
	99-1113	Valley Floor Community Park Acquisition	Kent Parks, Rec & Comm Serv
	99-1152	Martha Lake Airport Community Park	Snohomish County Parks Dept
<b>WWRP - Natural Areas</b>			
	00-1432	Chehalis River Surge Plain NAP	Natural Resources Dept of
	02-1090	Bone River and Niawiakum River NAPs	Natural Resources Dept of
	02-1184	Stavis NRCA / Kitsap Forest NAP 2002	Natural Resources Dept of
	06-1820	Cypress Island Natural Area 2006	Natural Resources Dept of

<b>Program</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>
<b>WWRP - State Parks</b>			
	00-1430	Burrows Island - TNC Property	State Parks
	02-1123	Deception Pass - Stavig Property 2002	State Parks
	02-1239	Cape Disappointment Acquisitions 2003	State Parks
	04-1237	Cape Disappointment - Seaview Dunes Ph.2	State Parks
	04-1339	Cape Disappointment - Gateway Center	State Parks
	06-1668	Cape D Bell's View Trail	State Parks
	06-1676	Belfair State Park - Phillips	State Parks
<b>WWRP - Trails</b>			
	00-1555	Railroad Trail/Alabama St. Overpass	Bellingham Parks & Rec Dept
	02-1292	Larry Scott Trail Dev. Segments 3 & 4	Jefferson Co Public Works
	02-1366	ODT Railroad Bridge Trailhead Parking	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
	04-1101	Issaquah-High Pt Regional Trail Connector	Issaquah City of
	04-1422	ODT: Jamestown S'Klallam Tribal Segment	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
	06-1653	Willapa Hills Trail- Chehalis to Adna	State Parks
	06-1682	Klickitat Trail - Lyle to Klickitat	State Parks
	06-1733	Castle Rock Riverfront Trail Extension	Castle Rock City of
	06-1738	Riverwalk Trail Phase 4	Puyallup City of
	06-1797	Lacey Woodland Trail Development	Lacey City of
	06-1804	Susie Stephens Trail	Winthrop Town of
	06-1823	Centennial Trail - Arlington Gap	Snohomish County Parks Dept
	06-1983	Chelatchie Prairie Railroad Trail	Clark County Public Works
<b>WWRP - Urban Wildlife</b>			
	00-1291	Mount Si NRCA 00	Natural Resources Dept of
	02-1098	Woodard Bay NRCA 02	Natural Resources Dept of
	02-1187	West Tiger Mountain NRCA 02	Natural Resources Dept of
	02-1221	Beaver Lk Natural Area Preserve, Phase 2	Sammamish City of
	02-1313	Issaquah Creek - Log Cabin Reach Acq	King Co Water & Land Res
	02-1352	Lost Continent of Illahee Watershed	Kitsap County Parks and Rec
	04-1349	West Tiger Mountain NRCA 04	Natural Resources Dept of
	06-1621	Magnuson Park Wetlands/Habitat Res	Seattle City of
	06-1940	Tukes Mountain DNR Land Acquisition	Battle Ground City of
<b>WWRP - Water Access</b>			
	00-1562	Waterfront Acquisition, Allyn	Allyn Port of
	00-1579	Laughlin Cove	Kitsap County Parks and Rec

**Item 2E**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Policy Report  
Prepared By: Steve McLellan, Policy Director

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

## Summary

The Policy Section is working on a number of issues at the request of the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board), the legislature, and the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) staff and director. This memo highlights the status of some key efforts.

### Grant programs for community gardens

Policy staff is meeting with stakeholders to assess the viability of establishing a stand-alone grant program for community gardens. Currently, community gardens are clearly eligible for funding in the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Local Parks category. The board has funded a number of community gardens in both categories as part of larger park proposals. While state funding for a new grant program is unlikely in the current budget environment, there is a significant possibility that federal funds may become available. Both existing categories of grant funding also would remain available.

Increasing the number of community gardens is a priority for the State Department of Health through the "Healthy Communities" initiative. A number of local jurisdictions also provide support for community gardens. In fact, Seattle's "P-Patch" program is one of the largest in the nation. A session on community gardens was one of the most highly attended at the recent Washington Recreation and Parks Association conference. If stakeholder work shows value in expanding RCO's grant programs for community gardens, staff could submit a proposal to the Office of Financial Management in early September for consideration as agency request legislation.

### Deed of Right

The RCO has used the current Deed of Right since at least 1968 to legally encumber real property that is acquired with grants from this board and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board and to protect the state's investment in perpetuity. The encumbrance dedicates the property to

the public purposes for which it was acquired (e.g., recreation, habitat, or salmon recovery). The Deed of Right is intended to be the legal document that prohibits any changes or conversions, unless the grant recipient obtains permissions from RCO/funding boards and further agrees to replace the converted property.

A project sponsor must legally record the Deed of Right after it takes title to the property, helping to ensure that the encumbrance stays with the land. It is intended to be enforceable against any successors and to put third parties on notice. A sponsor must provide a copy of the recorded Deed of Right to obtain RCO reimbursement.

The Deed of Right document has not been updated since its inception, so staff is updating the terms to more clearly reflect the intent of the document. Staff will provide periodic updates to the board as appropriate.

## **Compatible Secondary Uses Policy**

Staff continues to work with stakeholders on a revised compatible secondary use policy for acquisition projects. RCO's current policy allows multiple uses on acquired lands as long as the uses are (1) clearly compatible with the approved use in the project agreement, (2) clearly secondary to the approved use, and (3) approved by the director in writing. An incompatible use cannot occur on board-funded property. This policy effort will clarify which secondary land uses are clearly compatible with grant programs and will develop criteria and a process for approving compatible secondary uses. Staff anticipates bringing a policy proposal to both this board and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board later this year.

## **Level of Service Test**

The 2008 State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP) proposed testing the level of service concept. This test is on schedule. While participating agencies concur with the need for a tool of some kind with which to measure performance in parks and recreation, we are learning that the lack of data available from recreation-providing agencies is a major problem for the proposed LOS. "Baseline" data such as participation rates, facility capacity, and maintenance/operations needs are simply not available. Participating local agencies also are concerned that this could lead to a state mandate to use the LOS.

It is highly likely that the test will result in a recommendation to make significant changes to the LOS proposed in the 2008 SCORP. We anticipate including the test, test results, and LOS recommendation in the next version of SCORP, which is due in 2012-13.

## **Natural Resources Reform**

The Natural Resources Cabinet, established in the Governor's Executive Order on Natural Resources Reform, has begun to meet on a monthly basis. RCO's Director serves as a cabinet member. The Cabinet is tasked with overseeing implementation of the Executive Order, as well

as serving as a forum for discussing and resolving key natural resources policy issues. RCO is involved in a number of the workgroups that are tasked with implementing specific portions of the executive order including efforts to streamline grant and loan processes and to create “one front door” access to natural resources programs and services for citizens. In addition, the Cabinet is developing performance measures that will be used to bring natural resources into the Government Management and Accountability Program (GMAP) framework. The focus of the GMAP measures will be Puget Sound health and the implementation of the Executive Order.

## **Manuals**

Staff continues working on a project to improve internal RCO processes for identifying and making needed changes to program manuals. Staff also is exploring options for making the manuals and policies more easily searchable and usable by both program sponsors and RCO staff.

### Item 3

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Boating Infrastructure Grant Program; Funding of Projects for Federal Fiscal Year 2011  
Prepared By: Marguerite Austin, Recreation Section Manager

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Decision**

**Program Description:** *The purpose of this program is to develop and renovate boating facilities that target recreational boats 26 feet and larger. Funds also may be used to provide information and to enhance boater education.*

### Summary

The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) has received applications for three Tier 1 Boating Infrastructure Grant (BIG) project proposals and six Tier 2 BIG project proposals to review for federal fiscal year 2011 funding consideration. The Boating Programs Advisory Committee will evaluate and rank the projects in late August.

Tier 2 proposal are due to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on September 22, 2010. The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) will meet in August before the committee can rank the projects, and then again in late October. Due to this schedule, the board would not be able to consider the ranked list without calling a special meeting in early September. In light of this circumstance, staff is asking the board to delegate authority to the director to forward the list of eligible Washington State projects to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, consistent with the ranking of the evaluation committee.

### Strategic Plan Link

Consideration of these grant awards supports the board's strategy to provide funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance recreation opportunities statewide.

### Staff Recommendation

RCO staff recommends delegation of authority to the director to submit Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects, consistent with the evaluation committee's ranking, to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for consideration and/or national competition for federal fiscal year 2011 via resolution #2010-10.



## Program Policies

The U.S. Congress created the BIG Program under the Transportation Equity Act. The program, which is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), provides funds for developing and renovating boating facilities for recreational boats 26 feet and larger. Sponsors also may use funds to provide information and to enhance boater education. Facilities eligible for funding include transient moorage docks, breakwaters, and buoys.

The USFWS has established two “tiers” of grants.

- Tier 1 is for projects that request \$100,000 or less. Each year, Washington State may submit one Tier 1 application requesting up to \$100,000 on behalf of itself or an eligible sub-sponsor. Tier 1 applications are not guaranteed, but have a high probability of funding approval.
- Tier 2 is for projects that request \$100,001 or more. States may submit applications for any number of Tier 2 grants on behalf of itself or an eligible sub-sponsor. These projects are submitted for national competition with no assurances of success.

Rules governing Washington’s program are found in Manual #12, *Boating Infrastructure Grant Program: Policies and Project Selection*. Specific policies related to BIG are:

<b>Eligible Applicants:</b>	Local governments, state agencies, port districts, tribal governments, and private marinas and nonprofit organizations with facilities open to the general public
<b>Eligible Projects:</b>	Development, renovation, education, and information
<b>Match Requirements:</b>	Grant recipients must provide at least 25% matching funds in either cash or in-kind contributions.
<b>Funding Limits:</b>	Tier 1 – minimum grant request \$5,000, maximum \$95,000. <sup>1</sup> Tier 2 – minimum grant request \$100,001, there is no maximum.
<b>Public Access:</b>	Required for a minimum of 20 years
<b>Other Program Characteristics:</b>	Projects must be located on navigable waters. Key priorities in the evaluative process include partnerships, percent of sponsor match, innovation, and state plan priorities

<sup>1</sup> Generally, the award for each state is \$100,000. The Board’s adopted a policy is to set aside \$5,000 for program administration.

## BIG Allocation and Estimated Funds Available

On May 17, the USFWS announced that it would be accepting grant proposals for federal fiscal year 2011 funding. Although the Congressional budget has not yet been approved, the USFWS anticipates that about \$4 million will be available nationwide for Tier 1 projects, and \$10 million will be available for Tier 2 projects. Proposals for both programs are due to the USFWS by September 22, 2010.

## BIG Tier 1 and 2 Project Review for Federal Fiscal Year 2011

Using the evaluation criteria approved by the USFWS for this program, the Boating Programs Advisory Committee (BPAC) will review the BIG projects for federal fiscal year 2011 funding consideration. These evaluations are scheduled for mid- to late August.

The BPAC is composed of representatives from municipal governments, state agencies, and citizens who have expertise in boating and in managing boating access facilities. The current committee is:

<b>Member</b>	<b>Position</b>
David Smith, Moses Lake, Columbia Basin Walleye Club	Citizen
Del Jacobs, Port Ludlow	Citizen
Glen Jurges, Bremerton, Kitsap Poggie Club	Citizen
Lorena Landon, Kirkland, Bellevue Sail and Power Squadron	Citizen
Martha Comfort, Seattle, Northwest Yacht Brokers Association	Citizen
Michael Branstetter, Seattle, Scan Marine	Citizen
Reed Waite, Seattle	Citizen
Steve Greaves, Seattle, WA Alliance for Mandatory Boater Education	Citizen
Douglas Strong, City of Richland	Local Agency
William Cumming, Friday Harbor, San Juan County Sheriffs	Local Agency
Blain Reeves, Department of Natural Resources	State Agency

At the end of August, the committee will make a recommendation to the director concerning which proposals should be submitted to the USFWS. Based on the ranked list of projects, the agency will submit one Tier 1 project and one or more Tier 2 projects. In October, staff will provide the board with a list of all proposals and the director's decision.

## Attachments

Resolution 2010-10

- A. Summary of Applications Received for Federal Fiscal Year 2011

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board  
Resolution 2010-10  
Boating Infrastructure Grant Program  
Federal Fiscal Year 2011, Delegation of Authority to the Director

**WHEREAS**, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is accepting federal fiscal year 2011 grant applications for the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program, and

**WHEREAS**, the Boating Programs Advisory Committee evaluates these projects to help ensure consistency with the objectives of the Boating Infrastructure Grant Program managed by the USFWS and creates a ranked list of projects, and

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

**WHEREAS**, the projects must meet the program requirements stipulated in Manual #12, *Boating Infrastructure Grant Program: Policies* and rules established in the *Code of Federal Regulations*, thus supporting the board's strategy to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

**WHEREAS**, the evaluation committee cannot meet before the board's August meeting, and the deadline for submitting application to the USFWS is five weeks before the board's October meeting; and

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

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the director is authorized to submit Tier 1 and Tier 2 applications to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for evaluation and funding consideration in federal fiscal year 2011 consistent with the committee's evaluation and ranked list; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the board authorizes the director to submit and execute any and all project agreements and amendments necessary to facilitate implementation of the approved projects.

*Resolution moved by:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Resolution seconded by:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_

## Summary of Applications Received

### BIG Tier 1

Please note that the sponsors are still refining their budgets and project applications.

Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	Match	Total	Summarized Description
10-1344	Jerisich Dock Upgrades	City of Gig Harbor	\$32,940	\$32,940	\$65,880	Jerisich Dock is a public facility in the heart of downtown Gig Harbor that provides 42 feet of transient moorage, a seasonal pump out facility, restrooms, drinking fountain, life jacket kiosk, and a 3,000 sq. ft. dock with picnic tables and public viewing. This project will improve public amenities, increase boating & public safety, and maintain long-term public access. It includes electrical upgrades and replacing the existing fire suppression system, pump-out station, and bull rails.
10-1443	Moore-Clark Marina	La Conner Associates	\$42,198	\$14,066	\$56,264	The Moore-Clark Marina is part of a water-front mixed-use development in LaConner, WA. The Marina component consists of a new 300 foot dock and a six-thousand square foot over the water deck on which a restaurant is permitted. This grant is being sought to complete the infrastructure (electrical/water) connection to the new dock.
10-1587	Tacoma Youth Marine Center	Youth Marine Foundation	\$95,000	\$558,254	\$653,254	The Youth Marine Foundation (YMF) is creating the Tacoma Youth Marine Center on the eastern shore of the Thea Foss Waterway in downtown Tacoma, WA. Funding from the Boating Infrastructure Grant program is requested to complete a reconfiguration of existing docks at the property location. Existing docks are not sufficient to provide safe, permanent moorage for the large vessels used by the Tacoma Sea Scouts and other participating organizations. The project will provide 1033 linear feet of dock space on the waterway, including a public fuel dock and full pump-out facilities and other utilities.

## BIG Tier 2

Please note that the sponsors are still refining their budgets and project applications.

Number	Name	Sponsor	Request	Match	Total	Summarized Description
10-1135	Port of Kalama Transient Moorage Expansion Project	Port of Kalama	\$600,000	\$200,000	\$800,000	The marina sits at river mile 75 on the Columbia and is the only public boating facility for 85 river miles. We are proposing to expand the transient/guest dock moorage to accommodate larger vessels. The current transient dock is able to hold a maximum of two to three 26' vessels at once. The expansion would allow another twenty 26' vessels to dock.
10-1162	Chambers Creek Properties North Dock Phase II	Pierce Co Public Works	\$4,093,000	\$1,566,866	\$5,659,866	The Chamber Creek Properties is located in Pierce County Washington along the shores of South Puget Sound. This project (Phase II) will connect an existing pedestrian overpass (Phase I) with a 4,700 square foot dock with viewing and fishing piers, gangway and float suitable to accommodate the public and boaters with vessels 26' or larger. A 630 square foot gangway will connect the pier to a 1,200 square foot float that will provide tie downs on both side of the float.
10-1335	South Whidbey Harbor Transient Moorage Expansion	Port of South Whidbey Island	\$2,195,453	\$812,773	\$3,008,226	The Port of South Whidbey Harbor at Langley is a 34-slip harbor within the city limits of Langley. The facility is comprised of a palisade-type breakwater and floating docks. This small harbor frequently has demand for moorage well in excess of available spaces, particularly from larger vessels. The scope of this portion of the larger harbor expansion project includes the design, engineering, purchase and installation of a 370 foot by 20 foot breakwater structure to be used for transient moorage during the peak boating season

<b>Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Match</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Summarized Description</b>
10-1411	Sawmill Marina	Grays Harbor Historical SA	\$1,142,930	\$396,380	\$1,539,310	Aberdeen is trying to reenergize and diversify its economy by redeveloping some of its industrial shoreline. Although the City has 11 miles of shoreline, there is currently no public moorage. The sponsor has received a gift of an 18-acre sawmill for redevelopment as a mixed-use public waterfront facility. This grant will be used in Phase I to design and build a full access marina including a 400 foot dock (800 foot tie-up) with utilities and pump out, public restrooms, laundry and showers, public pier, shelter and related furniture.
10-1538	Cap Sante Boat Haven West Basin Transient Moorage	Port of Anacortes	\$1,479,470	\$1,479,470	\$2,958,940	Cap Sante Boat Haven has 30 dedicated transient moorage slips. The grant would be used to construct 42 transient moorage slips with updated infrastructure for full service overnight stays. The dock configuration provides about 1,970 linear feet of transient moorage slips.
10-1714	Dekalb Dock Repair and Upgrade	City of Port Orchard	\$325,000	\$111,213	\$436,213	The intent of the grant is to repair, replace, and lengthen the city of Port Orchard's only public dock. Lengthening the dock would also satisfy the Department of Natural Resources request that the pier be extended so that the floating portion of the dock not rest on the mud flats at low tide. The city envisions that the new dock design would include the ability for float planes to load and unload passengers. Once the repair and upgrade is completed, the dock and pier would allow vessels 26 feet or larger to have a place for temporary moorage.

**Item 4**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Acquisition Policy Updates and Potential Changes  
Prepared By: Leslie Ryan-Connelly, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

### Summary

RCO staff is working on updates and revisions to Manual #3: *Acquiring Lands*. Changes will include clarifying procedures; ensuring consistency with other laws and rules; incorporating board-approved policies; and revising existing policy. New changes to existing policies and procedures will be subject to a 30-day public comment period.

Procedural changes will be approved by the RCO director after the public comment period in September 2010. Substantive or significant policy changes will be presented to the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) at its meeting in October 2010. The goal is to have a revised manual available for the 2011 grant round. This memo outlines the process to achieve this aggressive timeline within the confines of the board's schedule.

### Strategic Plan Link

This work supports the board's strategy to "evaluate and develop strategic investment policies and plans so that projects selected for funding meet the state's recreation and conservation needs."

### Background

Over the past forty years, the board has funded 1,300 projects that have included acquisition of property. All board-funded projects that result in the acquisition of land or property rights must comply with policies adopted in Manual #3: *Acquiring Land*. The manual includes the types of projects that are eligible, policies (such as how to appraise property), and requirements for protecting the board's investment. This manual was last updated in March 2007. Since then, RCO staff has identified various clarifications, revisions, and new issues that warrant an update to the manual.

## Analysis

In December 2009, the RCO convened an internal Acquisition Team to discuss and propose revisions to acquisition procedures and policies. Team members include policy staff and grant management staff from the recreation, conservation, and salmon sections. The team intends to develop recommendations that work for all funding programs.

## Two Types of Recommendations

RCO staff will present a draft of all recommendations for the RCO director's consideration in July. The RCO director will determine at that time which of the team's recommendations are considered procedural and which issues constitute significant policy changes. All of the new significant procedural and policy recommendations will be released for public review. After public review, the director will act on those changes that are within her authority to approve and the significant policy changes will be forwarded to the board for consideration in the fall.

### Procedural and Clarification-only Changes

Some changes are procedural, policy clarifications, or updates that reflect current laws, rules, and policies. Staff will draft these changes, solicit public comment and share them with the RCO director for review and consideration. Those changes that have already been approved by the board or reflect current law or statute will be incorporated immediately. Examples of changes to procedures or general updates are:

- Procedures for approving and recording legal documents;
- Consistency with other program-specific policies already approved by the board;
- Adding information regarding cultural resources; and
- Clarifying requirements for compliance with the federal Uniform Relocation Act and the state's real property acquisition statute.

### Significant Policy Changes

Changes that are more complex or significant will require public review and board consideration and approval. Staff will draft significant changes, provide them to stakeholders and the public for review, and forward final recommendations to the board for consideration.

The examples below are considered significant policy changes because they may affect grant expenditures or a sponsor's ability to acquire a certain piece of property. For example, staff will clarify eligible costs for cultural resources review, legal fees, relocation, and stewardship planning. In addition, staff is considering the following policy changes for public review and board adoption. Other policy changes are also being considered.



**Should the board allow land costs to be an eligible pre-agreement cost rather than issuing a waiver of retroactivity?**

- Current policy allows sponsors to acquire property before a grant is awarded through a "waiver of retroactivity." If they receive a grant for the property, the acquisition cost is eligible for reimbursement.
- Current policy also allows sponsors to seek reimbursement for eligible costs that they incur before the agreement is signed with RCO. These costs include administration and "incidentals."
- Replacing the waiver of retroactivity with a policy allowing the acquisition cost to be eligible for grant funding as a pre-agreement cost could streamline the process for sponsors and staff. Staff intends to propose a policy that retains the property restrictions currently covered by the waiver of retroactivity.

**Should the board change the criteria for interim land uses so that they consider the project purpose, including habitat conservation?**

- Current "interim use" policy allows two types of uses to continue after a grant funded acquisition:
  - a second party may continue to use a property for up to three years past the date the property was acquired with grant funding, and
  - a "life estate" allows the seller to use the grant-funded property until the end of his or her life.

In either situation, the activity must have no more than a minimal impact on public use. However, the policy does not consider the effect of the activities on other important attributes such as habitat conservation or salmon recovery needs. For example, should the director consider impacts of a life estate that retains grazing or agricultural practices within a riparian area for a salmon recovery project?

- Staff is evaluating whether to add language that would allow for interim uses when the use would have minimal impact to the purpose of the project as originally funded. Doing so would allow the policy to be used across grant programs with different purposes and ensure all impacts to the original scope – rather than just public use – are considered.

**Should the board require all acquisition projects to meet federal appraisal standards?**

- The board currently requires acquisition projects funded with state money to commission an appraisal that meets Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) standards with additional RCO instructions.
- For federally funded projects, appraisal standards must meet federal guidelines called Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions (commonly known as "Yellow Book" standards).

- The different appraisal methodologies have led to some confusion from project sponsors and created challenges when a project matches state funds with federal funds. Shifting board policy to use only one appraisal methodology may help streamline the appraisal process and provide more clarity to sponsors about the grant requirements.

## **Proposed Policy Review and Approval Process**

Staff is trying to complete as much of the work as possible before the 2011 grant rounds begin. This means that any board decisions need to be made at the October meeting, or at a later special board meeting (currently unscheduled).

## **Stakeholder and Public Review**

Following the director's review, staff will make any significant procedural and policy proposals available for a 30-day public comment period in August.

- If the public and stakeholder response to a recommendation is generally positive, staff will finalize proposed policy language and request a board decision at the October meeting.
- If the response to a recommendation indicates a need for additional public or stakeholder involvement or outreach, staff will revise its timeline and approach accordingly for that recommendation specifically. This may involve a short delay (e.g., bringing the decision to the board early in 2011) or longer delays past the start of the 2011 grant rounds.

## **Board Action and Consideration**

Staff will provide copies of the policy proposals to the board before the August meeting. At the August board meeting, staff will summarize each proposal and the tenor of comments received to date. Since this meeting is scheduled as a brief conference call, staff will structure the presentation as a briefing only. We intend that a more in-depth board discussion would take place in October.

As noted above, staff will ask the board for policy decisions in October, as deemed appropriate from public comment. If the board would like more discussion or changes to the proposals before making a decision, we may ask the board to hold its first meeting of 2011 in early January, rather than March. Doing so would allow additional policy development time, while still ensuring that the policies are in place for the grant cycle.

## **Next Steps**

## **Implementation**

As RCO management or the board approves new procedures and policies, RCO grant managers will receive training on the new approach. In addition, communications to project sponsors will occur through RCO's monthly email newsletter "Grant News You Can Use", direct

communication to project sponsors through letters and emails, and web posting of new manuals and materials.

## **Related Policy Efforts**

Policy staff is addressing some acquisition policy issues separately because they involve a greater level of analysis or stakeholder participation. These efforts include revising the compatible uses policy and establishing requirements for protecting water right acquisitions. The board will hear briefings and recommendations on these efforts independently from the scope of the general acquisition manual update discussed in this memo. As new board policies are approved related to these efforts, they will be incorporated into the acquisitions manual.

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Conversion Request: City of Newcastle, May Creek Trail Addition, RCO #91-211  
Prepared By: Laura Moxham, Outdoor Grants Manager  
Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Decision****Summary**

The City of Newcastle is asking the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) to approve the conversion of approximately 2.5 acres of the May Creek Trail Addition project located along Coal Creek Parkway. The city proposes to replace this property with about 1.1 acres of similar property.

**Strategic Plan Link**

Consideration of this conversion supports the board's strategy to provide funding to protect, and enhance recreation opportunities statewide, as well as its objective to ensure that funded projects are managed in conformance with existing legal authorities.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the board approve the conversion via Resolution #2010-11, subject to the city executing all necessary materials within 180 days of board approval.

**Background**

In 1991, the King County acquired 40.06 acres, for a route to build a future 18-mile soft surface trail connecting May Creek, Cougar Mountain, Coal Creek, and Lake Washington trails. The property was transferred to the city of Newcastle following its incorporation in 1994. The trail does not yet exist. The following table summarizes the original grant.

<b>Project Name:</b>	May Creek Trail Addition	<b>Project #:</b>	91-211A
<b>Grant Program:</b>	WWRP-Trails	<b>Board funded date:</b>	July 1, 1991
<b>RCO Amount:</b>	\$267,915	<b>Original Purpose:</b> Acquire parcels to support trails that would link the May Creek/Honey Creek greenbelt with Cougar Mountain Regional Park.	
<b>Total Amount:</b>	\$535,830		
<b>Acres:</b>	40.06, multiple parcels		

In 2004, the RCO conducted a site visit and learned about the potential conversion. The city had allowed the Issaquah School District to construct a surface water pond within May Creek Park on property they thought was purchased with King County Open Space funds. They later learned that the facility was on property purchased with WWRP funding.

The city identified several possible replacement properties (see analysis, below), which the RCO rejected because they did not have equivalent recreational value or utility. The city then identified a parcel located at SE 89th Place as a potential replacement property (Attachment A). The property has many of the qualities the initially funded property contains, including a natural connection with the existing May Creek Trail and a regional connection with the Mountains to Sound route. The property is currently vacant, and has a subterranean water pipeline right of way that bisects the property. The owner of this property was initially unwilling to sell this property.

In 2008, the owner of this property indicated a willingness to sell if the city would accelerate the closing time. The city agreed, and purchased the property. The RCO granted a waiver of retroactivity (#09-21) in May 2009 allowing the property to be considered as replacement property for this conversion (this action did not constitute approval of the conversion).

## Analysis

When reviewing conversion requests, the RCO considers the following factors, in addition to the scope of the original grant and the proposed substitution of land or facilities<sup>1</sup>.

Factor	Staff Finding
All practical alternatives to the conversion have been evaluated and rejected on a sound basis.	The conversion has already taken place, so staff could evaluate only the replacement property alternatives.
The fair market value of the converted property has been established and the proposed replacement land is of at least equal fair market value.	Meets
Justification exists to show that the replacement site has at least reasonably equivalent utility and location.	Meets
The public has opportunities for participation in the process.	Public notice has been given regarding the replacement property.

<sup>1</sup> Manual #7: *Funded Projects: Policies and the Project Agreement*

## Evaluation of Practical Alternatives

RCO policy speaks to the evaluation of alternatives to the conversion. In this case, however, RCO discovered the conversion after the fact, so staff could only evaluate alternative replacement properties.

## Evaluation of Replacement Properties

An initial property under consideration was the property given to the city by the Issaquah School District in exchange for allowing them to construct a surface water detention facility on the conversion property. This property possesses a route for a proposed trail in Newcastle (Milepost Trail) and is intended to remain open for recreational endeavors. However, the property does not add to May Creek Park or directly create a connection to the May Creek Trail. Therefore, it did not warrant further consideration as an appropriate transfer for replacement.

Other properties that were considered for possible replacement were situated on the west side of Coal Creek Parkway where a wetland was enhanced during the recent expansion of Coal Creek Parkway. Discussions between the City and the RCO resulted in the RCO determining that the properties in question did not meet the threshold of being equivalent in utility or usefulness, therefore these properties were eliminated from consideration as replacement properties.

The city then identified the parcel that is now proposed as replacement property. The property has a natural connection with the existing May Creek Trail and a regional connection with the Mountains to Sound route. As noted below, it has reasonably equivalent utility and value, as well as being connected to the original acquisition. The city purchased the property and has a waiver of retroactivity from the RCO.

## Evaluation of Fair Market Value

While the differences of the two properties result in a deficit of acreage, the value of the replacement property is considerably higher than the property to be converted. Given the higher market value and the recreational utility (below), staff believes that the reduction in acreage is acceptable.

Property to be Converted	Replacement Property	Difference
2.5 acres	1.1 acres	- 1.4 acres
Appraised Value \$113,000	Appraised Value \$200,000	+ \$87,000

## Evaluation of Reasonably Equivalent Utility and Location

In evaluating utility and location, RCO staff considered whether the replacement property added to May Creek Park and created a connection to the May Creek Trail. The original intent of the grant was to support development of an 18-mile connector trail, so staff believed that the

replacement property should support that effort. Further, the property to be converted was to remain in a predominantly forested state.

## Replacement Property

The public currently uses the replacement property as an informal trail that connects to the May Creek Trail. Plans for the trail, which are referenced in the City's Comprehensive Plan and the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, include this segment becoming an official city trail. A trail through this property supports the effort to have the May Creek Trail eventually form a regional connection with the Mountains to Sound route and provide for a connection to the Waterline Trail. The property would remain primarily forest. (Attachment B)

The property also contains a section of the old railroad bed that was used by the Seattle Coal and Transportation Company to route coal mined in Newcastle to Seattle in the 1800s. The city wants to protect this historical component of the site.

## Evaluation of Public Participation

Discussions of the property conversion took place during several City Council meetings, but the conversion was not an agenda item with notice to the public. The city posted public notice signs at the sites of the conversion and replacement properties, at City Hall and Lake Boren Park, and on the main page of the city's website from August 21 until September 28, 2009. During this time, the city received no comments regarding the proposed property conversion.

## Next Steps

If the board approves the conversion, RCO staff will execute the necessary amendments to amend the project agreement as directed.

## Attachments

Resolution 2010-11

- A. Map of properties proposed for conversion and replacement
- B. City of Newcastle's Trail Map

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board  
Resolution 2010-11  
Approving Conversion for May Creek Trail Addition (RCO #91-211)

**WHEREAS**, King County (county) used a grant from the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Trails category to acquire property to extend the May Creek Trail and designated the areas as open space with public outdoor recreation purposes; and

**WHEREAS**, the county then transferred the property to the City of Newcastle (city) following the city's incorporation; and

**WHEREAS**, the city permitted conversion of a portion of the property to a surface water detention pond; and

**WHEREAS**, as a result of this conversion, the property no longer satisfies the conditions of the RCO grant; and

**WHEREAS**, the city is asking for Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) approval to replace the converted property after the fact with a property that could extend the May Creek Trail, as envisioned in the original project scope; and

**WHEREAS**, the site will continue to provide opportunities as described in the original agreement, thereby supporting the board's goals to provide funding for projects that result in public outdoor recreation purposes and the expansion of trails;

**WHEREAS**, the sponsor sought public comment on the conversion and discussed it during open public meetings, thereby supporting the board's strategy to regularly seek public feedback in policy and funding decisions; and

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board approves the conversion request and the proposed replacement site for RCO Project #91-211A May Creek Trail Addition, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, the board authorizes the director to execute the necessary amendments, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this approval is conditioned on the sponsor executing all necessary materials within 180 days of board approval or the action is reversed.

*Resolution moved by:* \_\_\_\_\_


*Resolution seconded by:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)*

*Date:* \_\_\_\_\_




## Map of properties proposed for conversion and replacement





## Map of Newcastle Trails



## Item 6

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Request for Board Guidance: City of Kent Stormwater Proposal  
RCO #04-1143 (Clark Lake Park Expansion 04)  
Prepared By: Karl Jacobs, Outdoor Grants Manager

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

### Summary

The city of Kent (city) is proposing to use a portion of Clark Lake Park for off-site stormwater detention and treatment. The park was acquired in part with grants from Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) and Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), and there is a current 6(f)(3) boundary protecting the park. The proposed stormwater pond is designed to have both ecological and passive recreational benefits to the park. The city and staff are asking the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board to provide direction on whether this proposal constitutes a conversion.

### Strategic Plan Link

Evaluating this proposal and its policy implications supports the board's strategies to "Evaluate and develop policies and plans so that projects selected for funding meet the state's recreation and conservation needs" and "...adapt management to meet changing needs."

### Background

The city of Kent's 127-acre Clark Lake Park is for passive recreational use such as walking trails and fishing access. The board funded four acquisition projects for the park:

- About 39 acres were purchased with LWCF funding through projects 99-1161 and 04-1143.
- About 67 acres were purchased with WWRP-Local Parks funding through projects 91-230 and 00-1379.

The total grant amounts are nearly \$2 million. The city provided nearly \$4.5 million in match through cash and conservation futures.

Several years ago, the city began exploring an expansion of their city Public Works maintenance and operations facility located just south of and across the street (SE 248<sup>th</sup> St) from Clark Lake Park (Attachment A). The current maintenance facility consists of gravel parking and a few storage containers. The expansion would include a new building and parking area, and require stormwater mitigation.

The Parks Department approached the Public Works Department about directing the stormwater into the park to increase stream flow and add a pond that would serve wildlife and people. The city also believes that the increase in water flow out of Clark Lake would improve spawning salmon habitat in the outflow stream.

## City Proposal

The city is proposing to add a new stormwater detention pond that would take advantage of a low, wetland area in the southeast corner of the park. The pond would flow into an existing stream ("Stream A") that flows into Clark Lake. "Stream A" has its headwaters at a nearby stormwater pond. The stream flows intermittently during rain events and is dry for several months of the year. As designed, the pond would cover about 1 acre during normal operating conditions, and about 1.4 acres during emergency overflow conditions.

The city has completed extensive permitting through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington State Department of Ecology, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the city's Community Development and Planning Services. Among other permit conditions, the city will:

- plant and maintain wetland and buffer areas;
- add boulders and large woody material to "Stream A" within the park (Attachment B);
- plant native and remove invasive species from "Stream A" within the park; and
- plant a variety of native species in and around the stormwater pond.

The proposal also includes the following new recreational amenities in this under-utilized corner of the park (Attachment C):

- Perimeter trail around the pond;
- Split-rail fencing along the new trail near the pond;
- Pedestrian bridge to connect the existing park trail system to the pond;
- Trails into the wetland mitigation sites with viewing areas;
- Informational kiosks for wetland mitigation, native plant identification, and stormwater detention and treatment;
- Updated trail maps and brochures; and
- Park benches.

Further, the city Public Works Department will purchase one acre of new property for the Parks Department. Kent Parks has not yet identified the property, but anticipates that this acquisition will expand Clark Lake Park. If they are unable to do so, they may use the funds to provide another opportunity for passive natural open space with both habitat and recreational value in the Kent Parks system. This amount is roughly equivalent to the surface area of the proposed stormwater pond during normal operating conditions.

## Alternatives Considered

Due to surrounding development, the only feasible alternative is to build a walled stormwater retention pond on the maintenance and operations center site, which reduces usable space and flexibility of the site. The city eliminated the option of building an underground stormwater retention vault on the site due to budget concerns. Neither of these options would provide the added recreational and ecological benefit as the proposed stormwater pond at Clark Lake.

## Analysis

The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) currently has no specific guidelines for a request like this one, where the proposal is expected to have a minimal impact and provide immediate and direct benefits to the park.

- The proposed stormwater detention pond will be permanent, but will be placed in an area that is already wet, so there is essentially no loss of use of the subject property.
- Passive recreational elements such as trails, benches and signage will increase the usability of this area.
- "Stream A," which currently is little more than an existing stormwater drainage ditch, will be improved.
- A one-acre portion of the project area will be "replaced" by the city.

## National Park Service Guidelines

The park was purchased with LWCF funds and has a 6f boundary, so RCO staff consulted with the National Park Service (NPS). The NPS does not have any specific design criteria, but they have occasionally allowed such stormwater uses in 6(f)(3) protected parks, and have not declared it a conversion, provided that the sponsor installs a bona fide recreation amenity, recreational uses are not diminished, and property rights are not transferred. NPS generally looks for a design that mimics a natural feature; for example, no square or rectangular boundaries, no chain link fencing, and efforts to disguise or hide any above-ground structures such as pumps or outfalls. They also have ensured that appropriate recreation features have been included, such as trails, benches, and interpretive signage.

## Next Steps

Staff is asking the board to provide guidance for the director to use in determining a course of action and developing a response to the City of Kent.

Possible options include:


1. Determine that this project is a bona fide recreation amenity that does not constitute a conversion. If the board makes the decision, staff can forward a letter to the NPS seeking concurrence that there is no federal action required.
2. Reject the proposal, and direct the city to make the request through the existing conversion process or pursue the alternative on their maintenance and operations center site.
3. Reject this and any future similar requests by taking the position that the board will not consider the use of grant assisted-properties for stormwater detention for off-site facilities, regardless of proposed mitigation or potential benefits.

If the board chooses option #1, staff also suggests that the board direct them to develop guidelines or criteria under which any future similar requests would be assessed.


## Attachments

- A. Maps of Clark Lake Park
- B. Stream A Channel Modifications design plans
- C. Stormwater Detention Pond design plans











Area proposed for retention pond



Stream A Channel Modifications design plans



## Stormwater Detention Pond Design Plans



**Item 7A**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: RCO Performance Measures Update  
Prepared By: Rebecca Connolly, Board Liaison and Accountability Manager

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing****Summary**

The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) uses performance measures to help the agency reduce reappropriation and improve the way we do business. Staff combines the measures and the agency work plan updates in the monthly Government Management Accountability and Performance (GMAP) report. This memo provides highlights of agency performance related to the projects and activities funded by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board).

**Analysis****Grant Management**

The following measures are among those that help us to check our processes at several points in the grant management cycle. All data are for recreation and conservation grants only. Additional detail is shown in the charts in Attachment A.

Measure	Target	FY 2010 Performance	Indicator
Percent of recreation/conservation projects closed on time	80%	63%	↓
Percent of recreation/conservation projects closed on time and without a time extension	50%	71%	↑
% recreation/conservation projects issued a project agreement within 120 days after the board funding date	75%	88%	↑
% of recreation/conservation grant projects under agreement within 180 days after the board funding date	95%	92%	↑
Fiscal month expenditures, recreation/conservation target	9.3%	20.2%	↑
Bills paid within 30 days: recreation/conservation projects	100%	66% Average days to pay = 28	↔

## Time Extensions

The board's adopted policy for progress on active funded projects requires staff to report all requests for time extensions and subsequent staff actions to the board. There are no time extensions for board consideration in June.

### *Time Extension Requests – Director Approved*

Since the beginning of the fiscal year, the RCO has received several requests to extend projects. Staff reviewed each request to ensure compliance with established policies. The following table shows information about the time extensions granted by quarter, as of June 4, 2010.

Quarter	Extensions Approved	Number of Repeat Extensions	Average Total Days Extended	Number Closed to Date
Q1	20	8	236	7
Q2	45	12	268	2
Q3	12	5	224	0
Q4	23	8	268	0

## Key Agency Activities




The RCO also tracks progress on key activities through its fiscal year work plan. The following are a few of the 49 actions that the operations team reviews on a monthly basis.

Agency Work Plan Task	Current Status	
Create operations manual for grant management	Senior OGMs made good progress this month by posting, reviewing, and/or completing several new chapters/topics.	↑
Re-categorize manual topics and launch web-based interface	Adding questions to the sponsor survey to better understand customer needs.	↔
Propose policies to encourage sustainable practices in grant programs.	Developed and began review of a draft work plan for 2010-11.	↑
Set milestone and project length estimates for specific types of projects	Data analysis completed and shared with section managers. We will redo this in July.	↑
Conduct survey of sponsors regarding satisfaction with grant management; Develop survey for evaluation process	Sponsor survey is in the final stages and should be distributed in late June or early July. We will repeat in June 2011, and then conduct it on a biennial basis.	↑
Develop outcome measures to comply with statutory requirements and board requests	Query for habitat acres under review. Work continues on how to count parks.	↔


## Attachments

### A. Performance Measure Charts


## Performance Measure Charts



### Cumulative Expenditures by Fiscal Month: Recreation and Conservation



### Percent of Bills Paid Within 30 Days: Recreation and Conservation Projects, FY 2010



## Item 7B

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Agency Strategic Plan and Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan  
Prepared By: Rebecca Connolly, Accountability Manager  
Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

### Summary

Although the Office of Financial Management (OFM) no longer requires agencies to submit their strategic plan as part of the budget process, it encourages agencies to revisit the plan and ensure it is clearly linked to the budget and meets statutory requirements.

The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) conducted a major rewrite of its strategic plan in 2008, so staff completed only minor revisions for the most recent update (Attachment A). Key elements of the revision are as follows:

- No changes to the agency's mission, vision, goals, or values;
- Removal of the Biodiversity Council to reflect its "sunset" date in the current biennium;
- Addition of the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office to the agency description and core work;
- Updated analysis of the operating environment (internal and external factors that affect the way the agency operates);
- Addition of a performance analysis section;
- Additional details about the strategic goals of the RCO-supported boards;
- Revised logic models to better connect the agency's work to statewide objectives;
- Addition of "framing questions" to place performance measures in context; and
- Revised objectives and strategies to achieve agency goals in the next biennium.

The board's strategic plan is reflected in the agency's strategic plan and its fiscal year work plans. At the time of this writing, staff is developing the agency's FY 2011 work plan, which will serve as a bridge to next biennium and the updated strategic plan. The management report at each board meeting includes updates on key portions of the work plan.

Staff will provide copies of the draft agency work plan to the board at its June meeting.

### Attachments

- A. Draft Agency Strategic Plan



2011-13  
Biennial  
Update

# Agency Strategic Plan



WASHINGTON STATE  
Recreation and  
Conservation Office



# About the Recreation and Conservation Office

The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) is a small state agency whose employees support the work of several boards.

- Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
- Salmon Recovery Funding Board
- Washington Invasive Species Council<sup>1</sup>
- Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health<sup>1</sup>
- Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group<sup>1</sup>

RCO administers 14 grant programs that provide millions of dollars to local communities for recreation, conservation, and salmon recovery. The agency makes these investments through processes in which local, state, federal, tribal, and non-government organizations compete for grants, using established criteria.

RCO also is responsible for completing plans and studies in response to requests from the Legislature, and for developing policies for the boards.

RCO staff coordinates the state's approach to watershed and salmon recovery monitoring, natural resource data collection, and invasive species management.

RCO also includes the Governor's Salmon Recovery Office, whose mission is to recover salmon populations in Washington to a healthy, harvestable level, and to improve the habitats upon which salmon rely.

## Agency Values

### **We are good stewards of public resources.**

We make strategic investments through a fair and impartial grant process that selects the best and most important projects.

### **We are leaders.**

We empower others to work together to protect, conserve, and restore valuable lands and resources. We serve as a catalyst for creating and moving toward a shared vision of a Washington with abundant recreational opportunities and its valued lands, plants, fish, and wildlife protected and restored.

### **We value people.**

We recognize that collaboration and relationships with our grant recipients, employees, volunteers, the public, and others make us successful. We listen and respect community interests and priorities in our grant processes. Our workplace is a healthy, respectful, family-friendly place where employees learn and find innovative ways to achieve our mission.

---

<sup>1</sup> The following sunset dates are currently in place: Invasive Species Council, December 2011; Monitoring Forum, June 2011; Lands Group, July 2012. Appendix D includes more information about this and other organizational changes.

# Table of Contents

Strategic Direction.....	4
Vision .....	4
Mission .....	4
Goals.....	4
Implementing the Strategic Direction .....	5
How We Will Fulfill Goal #1 Manage the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us in an effective, efficient, and open way.....	5
Objectives and Strategies.....	5
Connection to Statewide Priorities and the Priorities of Government.....	6
Key Performance Measures.....	6
How We Will Fulfill Goal #2: Protect and improve ecosystems so that they sustain our biodiversity: plants, wildlife, fish, and people .....	7
Objectives and Strategies.....	7
Connection to Statewide Priorities and the Priorities of Government.....	8
Key Performance Measures.....	8
How We Will Fulfill Goal #3: Protect and improve outdoor recreation opportunities to improve the health and well-being of Washingtonians.....	9
Objectives and Strategies.....	9
Connection to Statewide Priorities and the Priorities of Government.....	9
Key Performance Measures.....	9
Appendices .....	10
Appendix A: RCO Operations.....	11
Appendix B: Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Boards.....	14
Appendix C: Performance Analysis .....	20
Appendix D: Operating Environment.....	22

# Strategic Direction

## Vision

RCO is an exemplary grant management agency and provides leadership on complex natural resource and outdoor recreation issues.

## Mission

The RCO works with others to protect and improve the best of Washington's natural and outdoor recreational resources.

- We do this by developing strategies, promoting partnerships and coordination, and funding projects through fair processes that consider research, community priorities, and best practices.
- We do this because the people of Washington have entrusted us to be good stewards of public funds, believing that healthy ecosystems, open spaces, and outdoor recreation facilities improve the quality of life now and for future generations.

## Goals

- 1) Manage the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us in an effective, efficient, and open way.
- 2) Protect and improve ecosystems so that they sustain our biodiversity: plants, wildlife, fish, and people.
- 3) Protect and improve outdoor recreation opportunities to improve the health and well-being of Washingtonians.

# Implementing the Strategic Direction

**How We Will Fulfill Goal #1 Manage the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us in an effective, efficient, and open way.**

## Objectives and Strategies

**OBJECTIVE 1A: Increase the efficiency of grant processes and reduce the number and length of project delays.**

1. Increase use of technology to improve grant processes and business operations (e.g., wireless, GIS, data redundancy, etc.).
2. Update agency technology and improve PRISM functionality.
3. Review policies to streamline, reduce duplication or conflict, and align with agency goals.
4. Improve grant processes.
5. Improve our use of project milestones and other tools to monitor project progress.

**OBJECTIVE 1B: Maintain the high quality, impartiality, and accountability of grant programs.**

6. Review program policies (including evaluation criteria) to ensure that they are consistent with state priorities, federal mandates, and statutory intent.
7. Explore use of technology to assist with project evaluations.
8. Maintain customer satisfaction with workshops and grant management.
9. Expand the use of the sponsor profile for risk management purposes.
10. Expand our outreach for the volunteer evaluation and advisory committees so that we have a broader pool of evaluators.

**OBJECTIVE 1C: Maintain the state's existing investment in recreation, conservation, and salmon recovery.**

11. Improve RCO's ability and funding structure to support long-term grant and contract obligations.
12. Improve compliance systems (organizational practices and structure).
13. Promote economically sustainable projects and practices.


14. Develop and refine implementation of compliance policies, including consequences and sponsor education.
15. Improve the ability to map existing investments.

**OBJECTIVE 1D: Increase the efficiency of the salmon recovery local support structure.**

16. Regularly review region and lead entity performance.
17. Use the operating grant agreements to improve the integration between regional salmon recovery organizations and lead entities.
18. Obtain comprehensive, annual information on operating funds from all sources available to regional and lead entity organizations.
19. Explore options to support local sponsor capacity.
20. Provide grant management support for the Puget Sound Partnership.

**Connection to Statewide Priorities and the Priorities of Government**

- Improve the quality of Washington's natural resources.
- Improve cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the state.



**Key Performance Measures**

Framing Question	Measure
Is the evaluation process objective and fair?	Percent of applicants reporting that the evaluation is objective and fair
Do the grants meet a public need?	% statewide eligible applicants that applied for grants Number of applications by location
Is RCO managing grants efficiently and reducing project delays?	Percent of grants closed on time Agency re-appropriation rate
Is the local/regional salmon support structure working efficiently?	Measure in development.
Does RCO maintain the state's investments so that they continue to preserve and improve Washington?	Percent of grants in compliance

## **How We Will Fulfill Goal #2: Protect and improve ecosystems so that they sustain our biodiversity: plants, wildlife, fish, and people.**

### **Objectives and Strategies**

#### **OBJECTIVE 2A: Increase the state's ability to refine and implement salmon recovery plans.**

21. Help regions and lead entities coordinate with salmon recovery partners
22. Help develop strategies to secure funding for the full implementation of salmon recovery plans.
23. Continue to integrate the Habitat Work Schedule and PRISM and associated business processes.

#### **OBJECTIVE 2B: Support implementation of the five priority Invasive Species Council strategy recommendations.**

24. Increase public involvement in reporting invasive species.
25. Expand the baseline assessment of programs and activities that address invasive species beyond Puget Sound.
26. Maintain a Web clearinghouse for information.
27. Develop an early detection and rapid response network.
28. Improve agency coordination and collaboration on Invasive Species response.

#### **OBJECTIVE 2C: Support the state's implementation of its Biodiversity Conservation Strategy.**

29. Successfully transition the work of the Biodiversity Council to appropriate entities.

#### **OBJECTIVE 2D: Increase the environmental sustainability of grant-funded projects.**


30. Develop policies for sustainable practices.
31. Share information and best practices with local communities, project sponsors, and state agencies.
32. Help sponsors create sustainable recreational opportunities.
33. Educate sponsors about best practices regarding invasive species.

#### **OBJECTIVE 2E: Improve RCO's ability to measure and report progress toward achieving conservation and salmon recovery goals.**

34. Improve the usability of information about salmon recovery and watershed health reported in the "State of Salmon in Watersheds" report.
35. Develop systems and metrics for tracking and reporting progress in recovery plan implementation.
36. Help regional salmon recovery organizations coordinate monitoring and evaluation of regional progress in salmon recovery with statewide monitoring programs.
37. Implement 2011-13 communication plan.

## Connection to Statewide Priorities and the Priorities of Government

- Improve the quality of Washington's natural resources.



## Key Performance Measures

Framing Question	Measure
Is RCO addressing statewide needs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects funded by type, location, and (if applicable) species</li> </ul>
Is RCO protecting natural systems and landscapes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of stream miles opened to salmon</li> <li>• Acres protected by purpose (farmland, riparian, estuarine, etc)</li> </ul>
Is RCO reducing the effect of invasive species?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percent of priority invasive species with emergency response plan in place</li> <li>• Number of occurrences of each of the top 50 invasive species</li> </ul>
Is public awareness growing?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of public reports of invasive species via the hotline</li> </ul>
Are regional recovery plans being implemented?	Measure in development
Are RCO's efforts helping salmon and other native species?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of native species at risk</li> <li>• Listed salmonid abundance</li> </ul>

## How We Will Fulfill Goal #3: Protect and improve outdoor recreation opportunities to improve the health and well-being of Washingtonians.

### Objectives and Strategies

#### Objective 3A: Increase the opportunities for outdoor recreation statewide.


- 38. Collect, use, and share data regarding recreation
- 39. Help communities provide active recreation that offers opportunities to improve physical health.

#### Objective 3B: Improve our ability to measure and report progress toward achieving statewide recreation goals.

- 40. Implement 2011-13 communication plan.

### Connection to Statewide Priorities and the Priorities of Government

- Improve the health of Washingtonians.
- Improve cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the state.



### Key Performance Measures

Framing Question	Measure
Is RCO providing affordable access within reasonable proximity for the public?	Projects funded by location
Is RCO providing diverse opportunities?	Number and percent of recreation facilities acquired, developed, or renovated by type
Are these opportunities compatible with long-term stewardship?	Percent of projects that involve sustainable practices in design or building
Is there increased participation in recreation?	Percent of respondents to Office of Financial Management and statewide recreation surveys reporting participation in recreation
Are Washingtonians healthier?	State health rating (reported by Department of Health)



# Appendices

- ✓ Appendix A: RCO Operations
- ✓ Appendix B: Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Boards
- ✓ Appendix C: performance Analysis
- ✓ Appendix D: Operating Environment

## Appendix A: RCO Operations

### Statutory Authority

RCO is created in state law (Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 79A.25). The agency, and its boards, administer several chapters of RCWs and is responsible for significant activities under additional statutes.

- Salmon Recovery Funding Board ..... RCW 77.85.110
- Aquatic Lands Enhancement Program ..... RCW 79.90.245
- Non-highway and Off-Road Vehicles Activities .....RCW 46.09
- State Trails Act and Plan .....RCW 79A.35
- Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program.....RCW 79A.15
- Youth Athletic Facility Account .....RCW 43.99N.060
- Invasive Species Council ..... RCW 79A.25.310
- Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health ..... RCW 77.85.250
- Governor’s Salmon Recovery Office ..... RCW 77.85.030
- Lead Entity Program ..... RCW 77.85.050
- Regional Salmon Recovery Organizations ..... RCW 77.85.090

### Grant Program Restrictions

- **Federal restrictions:** Several grant programs managed by RCO are funded by federal funds. Various federal restrictions apply to the funds, projects, and long-term use and control of the properties.
- **Laws and Rules:** Projects funded by any of the RCO boards must meet all applicable laws and rules, including but not limited to cultural resource reviews, appraisal standards, the State Environmental Policy Act, National Environmental Policy Act, conformity to local and regional planning, Americans with Disabilities Act, permitting, and restrictions on use of funds.

## Core Work Activities

The Office of Financial Management (OFM) uses the “Agency Activity Inventory” to summarize the major activities of state agencies. In the inventory, each activity is assigned to the statewide result area to which it most contributes. RCO contributes to the following statewide priorities.

- Improve the health of Washingtonians
- Improve the quality of Washington's natural resources
- Improve cultural and recreational opportunities throughout the state

The activity inventory serves as the basis for budgeting and reporting performance to OFM.

## Manage Recreation and Conservation Investments

The **Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (RCFB)** helps finance recreation and conservation projects throughout the state. Funding is provided for parks, trails, beaches, boating facilities, firearm and archery ranges, wildlife habitat, and farmland preservation. Many state agencies, cities, towns, special districts, tribes, and nonprofits are eligible to apply for funding.

The RCFB sets policies for grants aimed at recreation and conservation. RCO supports the board, implements its funding decisions, and manages grants. Work includes pre-application support, application review, contract development and management, project support, and compliance.

## Manage Salmon Recovery Investments

The **Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB)** funds projects for the protection and restoration of salmon habitat and related projects. State agencies, municipal subdivisions, tribes, nonprofit organizations, regional fish enhancement groups, and landowners may apply for funding.

The RCO provides support to the board, implements its funding decisions, and manages grants. Work includes pre-application support, application review, working with review panels, contract development and management, project support, and compliance.

## Coordinate Salmon Recovery Efforts

The **Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (GSRO)** works with regional organizations and watershed-scale lead entities to coordinate and implement salmon recovery plans across the state. The regional recovery plans are a foundation for salmon recovery and projects reviewed for SRFB grants. Other GSRO work includes policy advice and development, identifying funding needs and options for salmon recovery efforts, and coordinating with other agencies. GSRO produces the biennial “State of Salmon in Watersheds” report.

## Develop and Coordinate a Statewide Invasive Species Strategy

**Washington's Invasive Species Council** facilitates a coordinated and strategic approach to prevent, detect, and respond to invasive species. Invasive species threaten Washington's wildlife and the lifestyles and opportunities residents expect. The council helps Washington focus on the highest priority actions. RCO provides staff and administrative support to the council.


## Monitor salmon recovery and watershed health

**Washington's Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health** provides a multi-agency venue for coordinating technical and policy issues related to monitoring salmon recovery and watershed health. The RCO provides staff and administrative support to the forum.

## Provide Efficient and Effective Administrative Support

RCO administration supports its various boards, and directs and supports the work of RCO. Administration includes leadership, policy, and clerical support, as well as communications, financial, personnel, planning, and information services.

### Organizational Chart



## Appendix B: Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Boards

The mission, goals, and objectives of RCO boards are important guiding principles for the agency.

### Recreation and Conservation Funding Board

#### Mission

Provide leadership and funding to help our partners protect and enhance Washington's natural and recreational resources for current and future generations.

#### Goals and Objectives *(to be updated based on board decision on June 24, 2010)*

##### **Goal 1: We help our partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation opportunities that benefit people, fish and wildlife, and ecosystems.**

- Objective 1A: Provide leadership to help our partners strategically invest in the protection, restoration, and development of habitat and recreation opportunities. We do this through policy development, coordination, and advocacy.
- Objective 1B: Provide funding to help partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation facilities and lands.

##### **Goal 2: We achieve a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us.**

- Objective 2A: Ensure funded projects and programs are managed efficiently, with integrity, in a fair and open manner, and in conformance with existing legal authorities.
- Objective 2B: Support activities that promote continuous quality improvement.

##### **Goal 3: We deliver successful projects by using broad public participation and feedback, monitoring, assessment, and adaptive management.**

- Objective 3A: Broaden public support and applicant pool for the Board's outdoor investment programs.

### Salmon Recovery Funding Board

#### Mission

The Salmon Recovery Funding Board provides funding for elements necessary to achieve overall salmon recovery, including habitat projects and other activities that result in sustainable and measurable benefits for salmon and other fish species.

## Goals and Strategies

### **Goal 1: Fund the best possible salmon recovery activities and projects through a fair process that considers science, community values and priorities, and coordination of efforts.**

- Allocation Strategy: Within the limits of the board's budget and priorities, fund projects, monitoring, and human capital in a way that best advances the salmon recovery effort.
- Process Strategy: Ensure that the processes to identify, prioritize, and fund projects are based on (1) regional salmon recovery plans, lead entity strategies, and tribal governments' salmon recovery goals, (2) sound science and technically appropriate design, and (3) community values and priorities.
- Funding Source Strategy: Identify gaps in current funding related to overall salmon recovery efforts and work with partners to seek and coordinate with other funding sources.

### **Goal 2: Be accountable for board investments by promoting public oversight, effective projects, and actions that result in the economical and efficient use of resources.**

- Accountability Strategy: Conduct all board activities clearly and openly, and ensure that the public can readily access information about use of public funds for salmon recovery efforts.
- Resource Strategy: Confirm the value of efficiency by funding actions that result in economical and timely use of resources for projects, human capital, and monitoring.
- Monitoring Strategy: Provide accountability for board funding by ensuring the implementation of board-funded projects and assessing their effectiveness, participate with other entities in supporting and coordinating statewide monitoring efforts, and use monitoring results to adaptively manage board funding policies.

### **Goal 3: Build understanding, acceptance, and support of salmon recovery efforts.**

- Support Strategy: Support the board's community-based partner organizations in their efforts to build local and regional support for salmon recovery.
- Partner Strategy: Build a broad partner base by engaging a variety of governmental and non-governmental organizations to address salmon recovery from different perspectives.

## Invasive Species Council

### **Mission**

The Council provides policy level direction, planning, and coordination that will: empower those engaged in the prevention, detection, and eradication of invasive species and include a strategic plan designed to build upon local, state, and regional efforts, while serving as a forum for invasive species education and communication.

## Goals and Priority Recommendations

**Goal 1: To foster cooperation, coordination, and communication among government agencies, stakeholders, land managing agencies, private landowners, and tribes.**

- Recommendation: Support targeted outreach campaigns to educate both public and private sectors on the damage caused by invasive species.

**Goal 2: To prevent the introduction and establishment of invasive species and reduce their adverse impact on Washington's environment, economy, and human health.**

- Recommendation: Enhance capacity to respond to invasive species by improving agencies' access to emergency funding and building on existing efforts to develop an interagency early detection and rapid response network.

**Goal 3: To refine and coordinate statewide capacity to identify, report, and respond to both newly discovered and existing invasive infestations.**

- Recommendation: Compile existing information and conduct a baseline assessment of invasive species information and programs in Washington.
- Recommendation: Develop a Web-based clearinghouse as the interchange for all existing invasive species information statewide.

**Goal 4: To assist those who manage invasive species through containment, control, and eradication efforts.**

- Recommendation: Increase and enhance communication across all entities to ensure coordinated approaches are supported and tools are accessible to address invasive species issues.

**Goal 5: To support the restoration and rehabilitation of key ecosystems adversely affected by invasive species.**

## Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health

### Purpose and Main Objectives

Coordinate policy and technical issues related to monitoring salmon recovery and watershed health. Its main objectives are to

- Provide for more efficient and effective use of monitoring resources among agencies;
- Recommend and standardize a set of measures to report progress towards salmon recovery and watershed health improvement; and
- Better guide (and improve accountability for) investments in salmon recovery and watershed health improvement.

## Statutory Responsibilities

- Provide a multi-agency venue for coordinating technical and policy actions related to monitoring salmon recovery and watershed health.
- Recommend a set of high-level indicators for use in the consolidated report on salmon recovery and watershed health.
- Invite participation of federal, tribal, regional, and local organizations that monitor, and working toward coordination and standardization of measures.
- Recommend to the governor and the legislature how to improve state agency monitoring programs.
- Review pilot programs including those that integrate (a) data collection, management, and access; and (b) information about habitat projects and project management.
- Make annual recommendations to the Office of Financial Management and the Legislature about agency budget requests for monitoring.
- Adopt high-level indicators for salmon recovery and watershed health and the protocols for monitoring those high-level indicators that will enable state monitoring efforts to be capable of reporting results that will ensure reporting consistency and agency compliance under the consolidated reporting requirements.

## Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group

### Mission Statement

The Lands Group's mission is to coordinate state habitat and recreation land acquisitions and disposals through improved communication, documentation, reporting, transparency, and planning.

### Statutory Duties


- Review agency land acquisition and disposal plans and policies to help ensure statewide coordination of habitat and recreation land acquisitions and disposals;
- Produce an interagency, statewide biennial forecast of habitat and recreation land acquisitions [acquisition] and disposal plans;
- Establish procedures for publishing the biennial forecast of acquisition and disposal plans on web sites or other centralized, easily accessible formats;
- Develop and convene an annual forum for agencies to coordinate their near-term acquisition and disposal plans;
- Develop a recommended method for interagency geographic information system based documentation of habitat and recreation lands in cooperation with other state agencies using geographic information systems;



- Develop recommendations for standardization of acquisition and disposal recordkeeping, including identifying a preferred process for centralizing acquisition data;
- Develop an approach for monitoring the success of acquisitions;
- Identify and commence a dialogue with key state and federal partners to develop an inventory of potential public lands for transfer into habitat and recreation land management status;
- Review existing and proposed habitat conservation plans on a regular basis to foster statewide coordination and save costs;
- Revisit the RCFB and Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program planning requirements to determine whether coordination of state agency habitat and recreation land acquisition and disposal could be improved by modifying those requirements; and
- Develop options for centralizing coordination of habitat and recreation land acquisition made with funds from federal grants.

## Relationship to Boards

The RCO strategic plan serves as an “umbrella” over the plans of the boards and council it supports. The mission, goals, and core work capture the entirety of the agency’s efforts to implement their priorities.



## Appendix C: Performance Analysis

*This section will be completed at the close of each fiscal year.*

This summary includes the key measures noted above, as well as some supporting management measures.

### Goal #1: Manage the Resources and Responsibilities Entrusted to Us in an Effective, Efficient, and Open Way.

Project Delivery and Delay	Target	FY 2010	FY 2011
Number of Grant Applicants	None	111	
% Statewide Eligible Applicants that Applied for Grants	None	12%	
Percent of Grants Closed on Time	80%	71%	
Percent of Projects Under Agreement on Time	95%	70%	
Percent of Funds Expended (Agency Re-appropriation)	9%	12%	
Percent of Grants in Compliance			
Percent of Applicants Reporting that the Evaluation is Objective and Fair			
Percent of Bills Paid Within 30 Days	100%	79%	
Annual Performance Evaluations Completed On Time (State Measure)	100%	52%	
Overall Average Employee Satisfaction	4.00	4.17	
Agency Recognizes and Connects Employee Performance to Agency Goals		3.56	

### Goal #2: Protect and Improve Ecosystems so that they Sustain its Biodiversity: Plants, Wildlife, Fish, and People.

Project Delivery and Delay	Target	FY 2010	FY 2011
Projects Funded by Type, Location, and (if applicable) Species	None		
Number of Stream Miles Opened to Salmon			
Acres Protected by Purpose (Farmland, Riparian, Estuarine, etc)			
Percent of Priority Invasive Species with Emergency Response Plans in Place			
Number of Occurrences of Each of the Top 50 Invasive Species			
Number of Public Reports of Invasive Species via the Hotline			
Number of Native Species at Risk			
Listed Salmonid Abundance: Adults			

### Goal #3: Protect and Improve Outdoor Recreation Opportunities to Improve the Health and Well-Being of Washingtonians.

Project Delivery and Delay	Target	FY 2010	FY 2011
Projects Funded by Location	None		
Number and Percent of Recreation Facilities Acquired, Developed, or Renovated by Type	90% of funded		
Percent of Projects that Involve Sustainable Practices in Design or Building			
Percent of Respondents to OFM and Statewide Recreation Surveys Reporting Participation in Recreation	80%	71%	
State Health Rating (Reported by DOH)			

#### Accomplishments

- RCO has reduced its reappropriation rate from 57 percent in the 2003-05 biennium to 49 percent in the 2007-09 biennium. RCO is successfully using process improvements and performance measures to meet its target of a maximum biennial re-appropriation of 50 percent.


## Appendix D: Operating Environment

### Summary

- RCO has, and will continue to, experience significant organizational change as three of its councils reach their sunset dates between June 2010 and December 2011.
- Desire for more efficient and effective government, along with continued budgetary pressures, will lead to ongoing examination of the ways we deliver our programs. We will continue to improve our efficiency, including efforts to consolidate and coordinate work.
- Pressure on the state's capital budget could reduce the amount available for RCO grants and grant administration. Changes in RCO's grant portfolio will require the agency to evaluate whether the 3 percent administrative funding level is sufficient.
- RCO will need to continue to invest in its core database (PRISM) to meet business needs and improve process efficiency. RCO also will need to implement several technology tools, such as electronic billing and GIS mapping, to support basic business operations.
- Staff surveys indicate high employee satisfaction. RCO will need to build staff capacity and depth, and plan for transitions as staff members retire.
- Washington's growth in population will impact habitat protection and salmon recovery and may further harm sensitive natural resources. Growth will increase the demand for more outdoor recreation, as well as other governmental services. These increasing demands for more services create competing budgetary pressures. RCO needs to position itself as a contributor to meeting the state's recreation and overall environmental health goals.
- Public ownership of land cannot guarantee that resources will be protected or recreational opportunities will be provided. RCO needs to be an advocate to ensure the long-term stewardship and sustainability of the state's investments.
- Although customer expectations vary significantly, there are some common themes: They expect open and fair processes, they want technology to make processes more efficient, and they expect RCO to invest money wisely.
- Grant recipients are experiencing financial declines that weaken their ability to support new and existing projects.

## Organizational Change

RCO has, and will continue to, experience significant organizational change. The organizational chart reflects these changes.



## Effects of Organizational Change

**Governor's Salmon Recovery Office:** Seven regional salmon recovery organizations and 27 lead entities are the grass roots infrastructure for Washington's "bottom-up" approach to salmon recovery. The reorganization of GSRO into RCO in July 2009 – and the concurrent transfer of responsibility for the Lead Entity Program from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) to RCO – resulted in RCO having statewide responsibility for oversight of the organizational infrastructure for salmon recovery. Within RCO, GSRO is responsible for managing the RCO grant agreements that provide operating funds to the regional and lead entity organizations and also providing ongoing guidance and support for these organizations to deliver the work per the grant agreements. The move provides an opportunity for greater coordination of the GSRO responsibility for recovery plan implementation and the RCO's responsibility for managing grant-funded projects in the recovery plans.

**Biodiversity Council:** Since 2004, the Washington Biodiversity Council has developed a comprehensive, prioritized strategy that enables the state to sustainably protect its biodiversity heritage, and has begun implementation of that strategy. The factors that led to the creation of the Washington Biodiversity Council in 2004 continue to exist, so the council is working on a transition plan for its work, beginning with the 11-13 biennium. The plan will address the management of all ongoing projects and initiatives to be carried out by willing agencies or maintained by RCO staff until a permanent home can be found or funding expires. Having an effective plan that advances implementation of the Washington Biodiversity Conservation Strategy—regardless of what the entity is called or where it is housed—would maximize the investments the state has made in this work.

**Monitoring Forum:** The Washington Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health was created by the Legislature to coordinate policy and technical issues related to monitoring salmon recovery and watershed health. The 26-member forum includes state, federal, tribal, regional, and local organizations. Among its accomplishments, the Forum adopted high-level indicators for salmon recovery and watershed health along with protocols

for monitoring those high-level indicators. Together, these new practices will ensure reporting consistency across participating agencies. The anticipated loss of the forum will create a gap in our ability to measure the success of our recovery efforts.

**Invasive Species Council:** The Council was formed as a coordinating body to address the growing threat of invasive species to biodiversity and Washington's varied economic interests. Invasive species can produce serious, often irreversible, effects on rare species, ecosystem productivity, and recreation. This council brings together many independent programs from different state, federal and local implementers and coordinates the plans, education and outreach efforts, prioritization, and response actions. Among its achievements, the council developed an assessment tool to objectively set invasive species priorities for Washington, and conducted a baseline assessment for 15 priority species in the Puget Sound Basin. This group leveraged its \$200,000 biennial budget with more than \$380,000 in federal funding. The anticipated loss of the Invasive Species Council will create a gap in the state's ability to address the threat of invasive species.

**Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group:** The Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group (lands group) coordinates state agency habitat and recreation land acquisitions by making acquisition-planning information open and accessible to the public and others at an early stage in the process. The lands group already has established annual coordinating forums, a biennial acquisition forecast, a methodology to coordinate GIS data that will allow statewide mapping of acquisitions, and a monitoring program. It is unclear at this time what the group will recommend that the legislature do to continue the work after its July 2012 sunset date.

## Improving Key Business Practices and Strategies

### Grant Management Practices

Beginning in 2008, RCO has focused on improving project delivery and reducing the rate of capital budget re-appropriation. Major guidance has come from an assessment of policies and processes completed by Berk & Associates in February 2008 and from a process review done by Strategica in 2009. These reports provided a good basis for the strategies considered and implemented during the 2009-11 biennium.

- **The Berk report provided the agency with 36 specific recommendations. RCO has completed or begun implementing most of these recommendations.** Many do not have a specific result for "completion." For example, Recommendation #2 is that the agency should standardize its policies. RCO now considers standardization during policy development. Because that process is ongoing, we do not consider the recommendation "implemented."
- As a follow-up to the Berk & Associates report, RCO hired Strategica, Inc. to help analyze seven major grant management practices. The report identifies 26 changes to RCO's

business practices to improve staff efficiency, reduce grant manager workload, and benefit project sponsors. RCO has begun implementation of many of these as well.

## **Fiscal Practices**

- **RCO has transitioned to having all non-PRISM payments processed by the Office of Financial Management's Small Agency Client Services (SACS).** RCO staff still receives, codes, and approves all documents before submitting them to SACS for payment.
- **The agency is implementing a corrective action plan to address two findings noted by the state auditor.** First, RCO has started a risk-based approach to monitor the expenses claimed and match provided by sponsors. In this approach, some sponsors will need to submit full backup documentation with their reimbursement requests, others will receive an on-site audit of financial documentation, and others will experience no change. Second, the agency is working with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), to revise the agency's policies regarding cash advances. While recognizing the business needs of some sponsors, RCO needs its policy to be consistent with its agreement with NOAA.

## **Government Reform Initiatives**

Desire for more efficient and effective government, along with continued budgetary pressures, will lead to continued examination of opportunities for consolidation and coordination of functions.

- **RCO is a leading participant in efforts to create "one front door" for citizens to access natural resources programs and services.**
- **RCO also will play a significant role in efforts to streamline grant and contract processes.** As part of this overall assessment of government efficiency, it is possible that additional grant programs will become part of RCO to take advantage of the agencies demonstrated administrative expertise.
- **Finally, natural resources will become a more formal part of the Government Management and Accountability Process (GMAP)** with ongoing expectations and reporting requirements.

## **Consortium with Puget Sound Partnership**

The 2009-11 supplemental budget requires RCO to form a consortium with the Puget Sound Partnership to share certain office services. The agencies developed a plan to share services in three areas: reception and mail distribution, graphic design, and information technology. This will save RCO about \$73,000 a year. RCO will continue to manage grants and some pass-through funds for the partnership. The grant management role may increase with expected additional funding from congress.



## Financial Health

Overall, RCO's financial health is solid because the agency manages its administration and sizes its programs within the revenue available.

- RCO has used performance management tools to address its re-appropriation rate and improve the overall efficiency of its grant management. RCO compares monthly grant program expenditures to the levels needed to achieve its target re-appropriation.
- Funding for Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP), RCO's largest funding source, was increased to \$100 million in 2007, after staying near the \$50 million level since 1989. In 2009-11, WWRP was funded at \$70 million. WWRP funding has declined as a percentage of the state's bonds from 1989. Despite the economic downturn, demand remains strong.
- Funds for two RCO programs – Nonhighway and Off-road Vehicle Activities and Boating Facilities Program – were diverted to other agencies in the 2009-11 biennium. The Legislature recognized that the agency had a commitment to manage existing grants, and the agency retained its administrative funds during the biennium. Such actions demonstrate future funding risks.

## Challenges for Agency and Grant Program Funding

- **Pressure on the state's capital budget could reduce the amount available for RCO grants and administration.** The capital budget provides a substantial portion of program funds. The level of capital spending is constrained by the state debt limit (the total percentage of state general funds that can be spent for debt service). Decreases in overall state revenues have led to a decrease in the state's bonding capacity. While that situation is projected to recover later in the decade, the next one-to-two biennia could see reductions in the amount of capital spending allowable.
- **Changes in our grant portfolio require RCO to evaluate the 3 percent administrative funding level.** A comprehensive analysis of the current administrative limit is required. Several years ago, the 3 percent administrative limit was chosen. This was enough because of increasing federal awards, continuing administrative resources from other programs, and low administrative costs. This analysis will be done internally before the new 2011-13 budget is submitted. Changing the 3 percent may be a challenge in some programs. WWRP has the administrative amount listed in statute. This administrative study needs to focus on future funding projections and future administrative requirements. Funding strategies need to start with a better understanding of the administrative needs and program limitations. RCO needs to avoid supplementing studies and participating in activities that do not pay a proportionate share of administrative costs. At the same time, RCO must strive to be objective and fair to all funding sources.
- **RCO, its funding partners, and grant recipients need a shared assessment of the needs for grant funding.** For example, RCO is working with salmon recovery regional

organizations to estimate the cost to implement recovery plans, identify current sources and levels of funding, and find options for addressing those gaps.

- **A lack of stable funding sources – even in the best financial times – could compromise RCO’s ability to make new investments and to protect past investments.**

Funding levels are subject to revenue, public priorities, and many other factors. For example:

- In the past, funding from the motor vehicle fuel tax was believed to be stable. However, recently the Legislature diverted money from that fund and consumers are using less gas, making the tax less reliable. Because RCO depends on gasoline taxes to pay for grant administration costs, it needs to be concerned about larger trends of gasoline use and supply.
- State bonds also were seen as stable. Recently, the state bonds have been threatened due to overall budget constraints. Funding has continued at a lower level.
- Federal funds also are less stable because of significant delays and reductions. Some federal programs continue, but their long-term survival is questionable.

The following tables show the major programs for RCO and assess the stability of each program.

#### State Funds

Program	Source	09-11 Funding (millions)			Admin Limit	Funding Stability
		Grants	Admin	Total		
Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account	Geoduck sales, state bond funds	\$5.03	\$0.28	\$5.30	5.5%	Dependent on DNR and funds generated from aquatic lands, funds have been shifted to state bonds
Boating Facilities Program	Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax	\$0	\$2.81	\$2.81		Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax is trending lower. Fund diversions left no funds for grant programs, RCO determines the amount of operating budget.
Estuary and Salmon Recovery Program	State bond funds	\$6.79	\$0.21	\$7.00	3%	Bond programs dependent on bond debt limits, Governor, and legislation.
Firearm and Archery Range Recreation	Concealed weapons permit	\$0.50	\$0.04	\$0.53	7.8%	Projected to continue at stable level
Family Forest Fish Passage Program	State bond funds	\$4.85	\$0.15	\$5	3%	Bond programs dependent on bond debt limits, Governor, and legislation.
Nonhighway and Off-road Vehicle Activities	Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax, off-road vehicle permits	\$0	\$1.06	\$1.06	10%	Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax and off-road vehicle permits trending lower, recent fund diversions left no funds for grant programs

Program	Source	09-11 Funding (millions)			Admin Limit	Funding Stability
		Grants	Admin	Total		
Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration	State bond funds	\$32.10	\$0.99	\$33	3%	Bond programs dependent on bond debt limits, Governor, and legislation.
Salmon	State	\$9.70	\$0.30	\$10	3%	Bond programs dependent on bond debt limits, Governor, and legislation.
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program	State bond funds	\$67.90	\$2.10	\$70	3%	Bond programs dependent on bond debt limits, Governor, and legislation.
Youth Athletic Facilities	State bond funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	1%	Last funding received in 07-09. Bond programs dependent on Governor, legislation, bond debt limits

### Federal Funds

Program	Last 2 Federal FY Funding (millions)			Admin. Limit	Funding Stability
	Grants	Admin.	Total		
Boating Infrastructure Grant	\$0.19	\$0.01	\$0.20	5%	Projected to continue at \$100k/year plus possibility of national competition
Land and Water Conservation Fund	\$1	\$0.02	\$1.02	Admin not allowed	Funded through off-shore oil and gas drilling, it was projected to increase in the future, but the recent ruptured oil drilling operation raises questions about its stability. It allows indirect costs according to the agency's federal indirect rate.
Recreational Trails Program	\$3.36	\$0.25	\$3.61	7%	Currently restricted, received less than 1/2 of previous funding. Given monthly allotments, but not every month.
Salmon	\$49.96	\$1.55	\$51.50	3%	The agency is in its eighth year of funding from NOAA. This funding stream originally was not intended for this duration, so long-term predictions are difficult.

## Information Technology

### Current State

Overall, RCO's information technology system is solid.

- **The agency's technology policies and practices ensure business continuity.** In recent years, RCO has updated or replaced several components including the routing and switching equipment in its network, PRISM (the mission-critical application used by staff and the public

to manage grants), and three of its four Web sites. RCO has purchased new server hardware to replace its aging system, and is beginning to plan how to move its data. The agency also takes advantage of the Department of Information Services' services to protect information and data systems.

- **RCO uses technology in a manner that is consistent with and supportive of its business needs.** RCO maintains laptops for each employee, because many staff members do a significant amount of work off-site (e.g., inspections of grant sites). The agency replaces the laptops on a regular schedule (about 5 years). RCO has software licenses that cover all staff and has purchased benefits through a state contract that entitles the agency to upgrade software as new versions are introduced, including business software and operating systems.
- **The agency has made concerted efforts to increase productivity and efficiency through existing technology.** These include increased use of online training for sponsors on grant policies and reimbursement issues and the use of SharePoint to share information and convert processes from paper-based processes to electronic. RCO also has implemented an electronic routing of key contract elements to increase efficiency.
- **The agency is coordinating with the Puget Sound Partnership to share a chief information officer.**

## Anticipated Information Technology System Needs

- **RCO will need to continue to maintain and upgrade PRISM – its core database – to meet business needs and improve process efficiency.** This includes electronic routing for agreements and amendments, electronic billing to speed up reimbursement to sponsors, and developing tools that provide access to the intranet, data via the internet, and project maps. Funding for enhancements will be a challenge because the current budget level is sufficient only for maintenance and upgrading existing system functions.
- **RCO will need to research and implement several technology tools to support basic business operations.** These include an improved secure, wireless network connection for staff working in the field; improved GIS and mapping technology; a second site for data redundancy and business continuity in case of disaster; Web site content management; and a performance dashboard.
- **RCO and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) will need to integrate the Habitat Work Schedule and PRISM to create one seamless pre-application and funding process for salmon project sponsors, lead entities, and regions.** The Habitat Work Schedule includes project maps and information showing the spatial relationships and intended outcomes for completed, ongoing, and proposed projects across a given watershed. After transfer of the lead entity program to RCO, WDFW and RCO began to share responsibility for the management of Habitat Work Schedule as a data system for basic habitat project information. RCO and WDFW also are looking at further development and use of the Habitat Work Schedule for its potential to serve each agency's broader needs to track, report, and provide access to information about progress in

implementing projects and programs for salmon recovery. In 2008, a Web service was created to allow the transfer of data between the Habitat Work Schedule and PRISM.

- **RCO expects that it will need to prepare to transition its information technology resources (hardware, software, and staff) to the Department of Information Services at some point in the future.** The Legislature passed a bill in 2010 to provide the basis for a statewide, enterprise-based information technology strategy, including statewide plans and standards for the use of technology resources. The new server hardware platform noted above will allow RCO to move these resources to the new state data center should that option become available.

## Workforce Profile

RCO has nearly 60 employees. Senior management consists of the director, deputy director, and policy director. Other staff members belong to sections based on the boards they support and their function.

- **The agency and its boards set a high value on public participation, fair processes, efficiency, and results that meet the public needs.** Employees take great pride in giving good customer service and developing solid partnerships.
- **The 2009 agency self-assessment found that RCO staff generally rated RCO between “Good Progress” and “Solid Success” in its ability to take a coordinated, strategic approach to performance.** The agency is making solid improvements on collecting and analyzing performance information, and then connecting it to goals and individual performance. Staff recommended that the agency focus on setting priorities, improving processes, finding new ways to use technology, and improving communication.
- **The 2009 employee survey conducted by the Department of Personnel found that overall satisfaction rose to 4.17 out of 5 possible points.** Staff suggested that the agency could do a better job of recognizing good performance.

## Planning for Workforce Changes

- **About 23 percent of RCO staff members may be eligible to retire within the next ten years – six within the first five years, and eight in the following five years.** The positions filled with retirement eligible staff are critical to the agency and include the director, deputy director, and several other Washington Management Service positions. Also in 10 years, up to 25 percent of the agency’s current staff will be over 60 and about 30 percent will have worked for state government for 25 years or more.
- **RCO will need to facilitate knowledge sharing between staff members to build capacity and allow staff to successfully perform the positions where staff may be retiring.** RCO also may need to create development or training positions and formalize steps. This approach would attract college graduates and offer a bridge into the grant manager series. RCO can create development plans for individuals at no cost to the agency.

- **Both retirement eligible employees and younger generation employees will look for flexible work environments.** When rewriting policies, RCO should build in flexibility, including part-time positions or job sharing, although this may result in increased costs for items such as benefits.
- **Although RCO currently is an employer of choice, RCO will need to consider its best practices to meet increased recruiting demands.** RCO's best salespeople are current staff, so a great deal of focus should be placed on ensuring that the work environment reflects the positive messages needed in recruitment strategies. The agency may need to consider recruitment incentives and expanding the intern program to be competitive at college recruitment. RCO's recruitment should continue to be on a position-by-position basis, rather than a pool.

## Service Demands and Trends

### Long-Term Stewardship

Long-term stewardship means protecting state investments (usually in perpetuity) through changes in the needs and values of sponsors, funding programs, and society at large. For RCO grant programs, stewardship ranges from protection of habitat land to ensuring the ongoing upkeep and relevance of recreational facilities.

Stewardship efforts are pressured by invasive species, habitat fragmentation, and human demands to use lands. Public ownership of land cannot guarantee that resources will be protected, or that appropriate recreational opportunities will be provided without ongoing, responsible land management.

- **RCO policy works to provide certainty that harmful land use will be restricted without restricting options of future generations in making land use decisions.** RCO offers land preservation mechanisms, such as conservation easements, that preserve land in perpetuity and allow flexibility to respond to unanticipated economic, social, and environmental changes. By offering long-term or perpetual conservation tools, RCO protects habitat from risks of permanent conversion to other land uses.
- **RCO policy promotes partnerships that allow grant recipients to protect land over the long-term.** By promoting partnerships, RCO policies encourage communication about conservation and recreation plans and support coordinated project implementation.
- **The economic downturn has resulted in some grant recipients becoming less able to meet their stewardship obligations.** The grant agreement requires sponsors to ensure long-term stewardship, maintenance, and operation of funded sites and facilities. However, in recent years, revenues for many sponsors have dropped, while the population increases have led to greater service demands.

- **Few RCO grant programs can pay for maintenance, operations, or stewardship.** RCO does support efforts to identify long-term resources that protect land values and to prevent undermanaged lands from impacting private neighbors.
- **RCO needs to determine how it can meet its responsibility to ensure the long-term stewardship and sustainability of the state's investment in recreation, conversation, and habitat.** As the funding agency, RCO is obligated to ensure that grant recipients meet their responsibilities. These responsibilities make grant compliance a major agency task, one that grows with each new grant round. RCO will need to consider how to balance its resources between creating and preserving recreational and conservation assets throughout the state. Meeting this challenge may require more staff resources and simplification of current processes.

## State Acquisition of Lands for Conservation and Habitat

There have been concerns raised in the Legislature about continued state acquisition of lands for conservation and habitat, including the effect on rural economies of taking land out of private production and the ability of agency landowners to maintain adequate stewardship (such as noxious weed control) during a time of reduced resources. There also are ongoing efforts to develop voluntary approaches to land conservation for agricultural and forest lands and a growing policy preference for using alternatives to fee-simple acquisition of land, such as conservation easements.

## Habitat Trends and Considerations

RCO protects habitat by funding projects that protect identified priority habitats and species. A spectrum of grant programs are aimed at protecting and restoring high quality native ecosystems; endangered, threatened, or sensitive species; and habitat along the water. RCO habitat policy is designed to achieve flexibility in order to meet changing needs while ensuring accountability.

- **Population growth, climate change, inadequate land use management, and land use conversion due to development are among the primary threats to habitat conservation.** As more people are coming to enjoy Washington's natural beauty, the need to preserve habitat lands is increasing dramatically. Without adequate management funds, plant and animal species are not fully protected. Long-term management resources could allow stewardship that better protects habitat from human and other uses of the land. Adaptive management helps the agency make necessary policy changes based on changing needs.
- **There is more public and private collaboration for protecting habitat. RCO works with grant recipients to protect and enhance habitat lands.** Partnerships also help connect community priorities with statewide objectives. Effective partnerships are challenged by differing mandates among partners, which can make it difficult to carry proposals forward. They also struggle to provide necessary project resources. RCO ensures its habitat



grant programs fit with identified local and statewide goals or strategies, including the Biodiversity Strategy and the Puget Sound Action Agenda.

- **Perpetual conservation makes it easier to achieve statewide habitat protection goals and to respond to unexpected changes in the future, such as climate change.** Temporary protection only delays the potential for conversion and limits the ability to respond to future changes that impact habitat. RCO offers land preservation options that range from long-term leases to fee simple acquisition of habitat lands.
- **There is growing recognition that people use habitat land for recreation and other purposes.** Given an increasing shortage of land available for conservation, RCO works to meet multiple objectives on land and allow flexibility in the way land is used while still protecting vulnerable habitat.
- **There are gaps in funding to meet certain habitat protection needs, such as open space or wetland preservation.** RCO provides grants that meet specific needs, such as conserving riparian and aquatic lands. New fund sources aimed at filling conservation gaps could help strengthen the state's ability to protect habitat.

## Salmon Recovery Trends

- **Washington has 14 salmon and steelhead populations listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA).** NOAA has approved six salmon recovery plans, and a seventh (for Lake Ozette sockeye) is in development. The plans focus on the key aspects of salmon recovery, including goals and strategies, recovery actions, incentives for ESA compliance, adaptive management, and integration with economic, social, and cultural goals and impacts.
- **Funding pressure and natural resources issues affect RCO's ability to fund salmon recovery projects and maintain the locally-based structure that implements those projects.** The regional salmon recovery organizations and their partners are working to implement the recovery plans according to their schedules. Ongoing funding of the salmon recovery regions, lead entities, and SRFB restoration project grants will be critical for implementing those plans.
- **NOAA has initiated its five-year status review for Pacific salmon and steelhead populations listed under the Endangered Species Act to ensure the accuracy and classification of each listing.** The ESA requires a review of listed species at least every five years. Based on the review a determination is made whether a species should be delisted, reclassified from endangered to threatened or threatened to endangered, or whether the current classification should be retained. If a proposed change in listing status is determined to be warranted, NOAA will begin the process to change the rules.

## Recreation Trends

- **The most recent Washington State population survey indicates that recreation patterns between 2004 and 2008 were essentially unchanged.** Overall, the major



categories as reported in RCO's most recent statewide assessment probably still are accurate. Walking remains the top activity statewide. Other popular forms of recreation are sightseeing, gardening, outdoor photography, playground visits, and team sports of all kinds.

- **The national recession seems to have a mixed effect on outdoor recreation.** For example, there has been a documented decline in sales of major recreational products such as boats. However, this does not necessarily mean that people have stopped boating: they simply continue to use their existing boats. There is anecdotal evidence that people are seeking lower cost recreation opportunities; for example changing a resort-style vacation to a camping vacation.

## Health of Washingtonians

Physical activity, such as walking, bicycling, playing court and field sports, and swimming are known to improve personal health. The Washington State Nutrition and Physical Health Plan, published in 2008 by the Department of Health, lists three key objectives to improve the health of Washingtonians:

- **Increase the number of people who have access to free or low cost recreational opportunities for physical activity.** This includes a recommendation for adequate funding for state and local recreational sites and facilities.
- **Increase the number of physical activity opportunities available to children.**
- **Increase the number of active community environments in Washington.** Active Community Environments are places where people of all ages and abilities can easily enjoy walking, bicycling, and other forms of recreation.

## Natural Resource Considerations

Washington is one of the most biologically diverse states in the union. This is due to the state's diverse topography, its exposure to Pacific Ocean currents and weather patterns, and its location on the migratory path of many wildlife species. Washington's varied landscapes and eco-regions support not only a variety of birds, mammals, plants, and other elements of biodiversity, but also a diverse cross-section of people who live and work here. A healthy environment provides many benefits that improve the quality of life in the state, including clean air and water, flood control, and recreational opportunities.

- **Washington has made significant investments in watershed-based natural resource management activities, including watershed and salmon recovery planning and implementation.** The trend continues to be moving toward an integrated watershed approach recognizing that all elements in a watershed are related to one another. An integrated approach looks at overall watershed health based upon key factors affecting biodiversity and the ecosystem service provided by healthy watersheds. The Washington Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health recently adopted watershed health indicators to measure some of these watershed health factors.

- **Ocean health is a key factor in the health of Washington ecosystems.** Pollutants, sediments, and debris flushed by storm water from coastal landscapes. Ocean currents can carry these pollutants and harmful species far from their sources. Climate change could increase the spread of non-native marine species, alter the productivity of key ocean habitats, create more acidic ocean environments, and change the abundance and distribution of marine species that are a key part of the food chain for salmon and other species important to Washington's biodiversity.

## Customer Expectations

*This section will be updated in late summer 2010, following the sponsor satisfaction survey.*

RCO serves three, broad sets of customers with different levels of expectations. As depicted in the diagram, there is significant overlap between these groups.

- **Stakeholders:** These are the groups affected by our actions and success, in particular, all members of the public.
- **Grant Recipients:** The organizations that apply for and receive grants.
- **Partners:** Those who work with us to achieve our goals.

## Expectations

RCO uses a variety of mechanisms to capture customer expectations. This is done through both formal processes, such as soliciting public testimony at board meetings, and informal processes, such as direct contact with dozens of customers daily.

Although customer expectations vary significantly, there are some common themes:

- They expect the process, whether it's a grant round or a board meeting, to be efficient, open, fair and to be a worthwhile investment of time and money.
- They expect technology to make the process more efficient, to be easily used, and to be customizable.
- They expect RCO to invest money wisely and efficiently, and to protect or enhance the things that make Washington a great place to live, work, and play.

Currently, there are eight key systems to capture customer information:

Advisory groups	About 270 customers sit on 18 advisory panels, which make recommendations to RCO on program policies, grant reviews, special projects, and operational processes.
Customer surveys	RCO regularly surveys its customers to gauge their opinions on overall operations and on special projects. RCO also surveys its advisory groups after every grant round for suggested improvements.

Board membership	RCO's customers sit on its boards of directors, helping the agency keep customer needs in the forefront. RCO staff also sits on the boards of peer organizations to ensure that they understand the work of their customers.
Studies	RCO frequently hires outside experts to evaluate its systems and procedures to ensure they work for customers or to gauge customers' needs.
Board meetings	RCO schedules time at every board meeting to allow customers to comment on any agency business.
Meetings	RCO attends and hosts meetings of its customers, as well as educational workshops to share information and hear from customers.
Grant managers	A majority of RCO staff are grant managers, and as such have daily contact with customers. This allows for close integration with key customers.
Correspondence	RCO frequently communicates with customers through e-mail, telephone, list serves, the Web, meetings, and correspondence.

## Opportunities and Challenges for Customer Engagement

- Due to the economic downturn, many of RCO's partners will not be able to contribute as much volunteer time to evaluate grants. Also, interest has been low for advisory committee recruitments.
- The nature of communications is changing rapidly with the growth of Web services and the demise of newspapers. This creates challenges for reaching and actively engaging customers. It becomes more difficult to cut through the media "clutter" and engage customers in meaningful ways. Customers expect us to maintain the most current information on the web and provide them with immediate response to their requests.
- RCO is rewriting its communication plan, which will set new directions for its outreach efforts. However, declining budgets mean RCO's capacity for communication likely will not increase.
- RCO recently redesigned its agency Web site, with the goal of making it easier for customers to find the information they need to participate in board meetings, apply for grants, or do business with the agency. A new feature on the site was created for sharing news with grant sponsors. That section is meant to deliver important information that will help grant recipients succeed.


## Grant Recipients (Sponsors)

### Sponsors of Outdoor Recreation Sites and Facilities

The recipients of these grants include non-profit organizations, divisions of local government, tribes, state agencies, and federal agencies.

- Many of RCO's partners are continuing to work with the public to decide how to pay for the acquisition, development, renovation, and maintenance of the outdoor recreation sites and facilities it demands.
- The economic decline is putting great pressure on the resources of many sponsors, and has led to potential site closures, reduced maintenance, and staffing cuts.** Meanwhile, population growth has led to higher demands for service. The decisions made now will have long-range implications for both RCO and its partners. Delayed maintenance now will result in a greater need in the future. Sponsor requests to close parks generate work within RCO to ensure that any type of closure and/or reopening is consistent with contract terms. Staffing cuts mean that some sponsors will have difficulty in applying for grants, or may need more time to complete projects.
- The downturn also has reduced the ability of some sponsors to provide matching funds for their grant-funded projects.** Some sponsors have addressed this by requesting RCO grants from different categories to serve as match to each other.

Number of Sponsors by Type:  
Funded Recreation Projects




### Sponsors of Habitat, Farmland, and Riparian Conservation Projects

The recipients of these grants include non-profit organizations, divisions of local government, conservation districts, tribes, state agencies, and federal agencies.

- Many of RCO's partners are continuing to work with the public to decide how to pay for the acquisition, development, restoration, and maintenance of

Number of Sponsors by Type:  
Funded Habitat, Farmland, and Riparian  
Conservation Projects



the conservation sites and support facilities they demand.


- **The economic downturn has resulted in new partnerships** whereby non-profits are working more closely with counties and cities to secure and restore conservation sites. However, the same stressors noted above for recreations sponsors (e.g., lower staffing, less ability to maintain sites) affect conservation sponsors.
- **Economic stresses also are affecting other state agencies and local governments.** These stresses have resulted in a reduction in staff and may make it more difficult for them to sponsor projects, secure needed matching funds, and fulfill their stewardship obligations. These stresses are likely to continue over the next several years.
- **The downturn also has reduced the ability of some sponsors to provide matching funds for their grant-funded projects.** Some sponsors have addressed this by requesting RCO grants from different categories to serve as match to each other.

## Sponsors of Salmon Recovery Projects

Grant recipients include local agencies, special purpose districts, conservation districts, state agencies, Native American tribes, private landowners, nonprofits and regional fisheries enhancement groups.

- **The economic decline is affecting project sponsors and potential match sources.**
- **State agencies that support salmon recovery also are experiencing significant cuts in budget.** The Department of Fish and Wildlife, which provides technical assistance to project implementers, has had to cut its watershed steward program, among others, which directly impacts the ability of project sponsors to plan and implement projects.
- **Achieving salmon recovery goals will depend, in part, on the SRFB's ability to continue to provide an appropriate funding level for lead entity and regional recovery organizations.** Many of these organizations are experiencing significant declines in local resources that support their work. RCO, through GSRO, is working with the regional salmon recovery organizations to develop an accurate picture of funding levels for regional organization and lead entity operations around the state.

**Number of Sponsors by Type:  
Funded Salmon Habitat Projects**



## Population Growth

The state's population has grown by about 1.5 percent each year for the past five years. Immigration has slowed, but could increase as the state and national economies improve and the labor force enjoys more mobility.

### Implications for the RCO

- **Growing human populations commonly are identified as negative impacts on natural resources and habitat.** As people demand more food, housing, goods and services, more natural resources are consumed. New development takes away from available habitat. In fact, Washington's ecosystems are in steep decline, with 40 animals and 10 plants in danger of extinction.
- **Growing populations inevitably lead to changes in demand for outdoor recreation sites and facilities.** As the demographics of the state continue to change, recreation patterns will change. For example, in regions with large Hispanic populations, the community tends to use public spaces as an extension of the family space for gathering and celebration. As another example, the growing participation of girls in organized sports such as softball and soccer has led to increased demand for outdoor athletic facilities.
- **The growing population puts multiple, competing pressures on the state's budget for fundamental services.** Major state programs from schools and higher education to transportation are reporting increasing caseloads and workloads. The state budget has been unable to keep up with the growing demand.
- **The effect is demonstrated in the decline in the average per capita investment for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program –** RCO's major grant program. In the 20 years since the beginning of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, average investment has dropped from roughly \$9 to only \$4per capita.
- **In general, the population is aging, and baby boomers are entering retirement age.** There may not be enough people entering the workforce to fill their positions. In addition, participation in outdoor recreation tends to decline with age.

**Item 7C**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Board Strategic Plan and Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan  
Prepared By: Rebecca Connolly, Accountability Manager

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Decision**

### Summary

The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) approved its current strategic plan in June 2008. Staff is recommending that the board (1) remove the lists of general activities and deliverables in the plan and (2) add performance measures. A more detailed board work plan for each fiscal year would replace the activities and deliverables in the strategic plan.

Staff is asking the board to consider adopting the strategic plan either as written, or with changes as needed. In addition, staff is asking the board to approve the work plan approach, and indicate if there are additional items that staff should address in fiscal year 2011.

### Strategic Plan Link

Biennial review of the strategic plan is critical to achieving the board's goals.

### Staff Recommendation

Consistent with the approach used in 2008, staff recommends that the board adopt the revised strategic plan by motion.

In addition, staff recommends that the board approve the general work plan approach and format, and indicate if there are additional items that staff should address in fiscal year 2011.

### Background and Analysis

#### Strategic Plan

When the board approved its current strategic plan (Attachment A) in 2008, it made the following changes from prior versions:

1. Removed the specific tasks, assignments, and due dates that were in the plan in favor of a director-managed work plan and a list of general activities;
2. Added the Board's mission statement;
3. Added a list of guiding principles;
4. Classified the strategies into: (1) policy development, (2) coordination, (3) outreach and advocacy, and (4) strategic investment; and
5. Replaced measurements with "deliverables" to reflect the nature of the items listed.

Since then, staff has used the plan as a guidance document to develop board agendas and agency work plans. Items brought to the board for consideration have clear links to the strategic plan.

Based on board input, staff is proposing a more streamlined strategic plan that provides high-level direction and key performance measures rather than activities and deliverables. The mission, goals, principles, objectives, and strategies in the revised plan (Attachment B) are nearly identical to the existing language. Changes are marked with strikethrough and underline. Staff added performance measures that are aligned with those in the agency strategic plan.

The most significant change is the removal of the broad activities and deliverables. Staff revised the activities to make them more specific to the fiscal year, and moved them to the annual work plan. The deliverables proved to be an overly complicated measurement tool, so they have been eliminated in favor of the specific activities and high-level performance measures.

## **Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan for the Board**

In the past, staff has presented the work plan for the board as an agenda-setting tool. Consistent with the strategic plan framework above, staff recommends changing this format to demonstrate the specific actions that the board aims to accomplish in each fiscal year. The work plan (Attachment B) shows the link between each action and the board's strategic plan, along with an approximate timeframe for completion.

### **Attachments**

- A. Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Strategic Plan, Adopted in 2008
- B. Proposed Revised Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Strategic Plan
- C. Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan



## **Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Strategic Plan**

### **Mission**

Provide leadership and funding to help our partners protect and enhance Washington's natural and recreational resources for current and future generations.

### **Goals**

1. We help our partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation opportunities that benefit people, fish and wildlife, and ecosystems.
2. We achieve a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us.
3. We deliver successful projects by using broad public participation and feedback, monitoring, assessment, and adaptive management.

### **Guiding Principles**

Guiding principles are fundamental concepts that form the basis for Board policy.

- Principle 1.** The Board's primary roles are to (1) ensure the best possible investment of funds in protecting and improving habitats, ecosystems, and outdoor recreation opportunities, (2) provide accountability for those investments, and (3) provide citizen oversight to the funding process.
- Principle 2.** Successful protection and improvement of Washington's ecosystems and recreation requires coordination across all levels of government and geographic scales. Decisions and actions should be guided by a statewide perspective coupled with each local community's social, economic, and cultural values and priorities.
- Principle 3.** Federal, state, tribal, and local governments' plans and strategies (conservation and/or recreation) should help guide the identification and prioritization of projects.
- Principle 4.** Projects must have explicit objectives, as well as appropriate designs and implementation plans to meet those objectives.
- Principle 5.** The Board will continue to work with federal, tribal, state and local agencies, stakeholder organizations and other interested parties to evaluate and improve the funding process. The Board also will continue to ensure that it funds the highest priority projects with integrity and impartiality and provides accountability to the Legislature and the public for that funding.

<b>Goal 1</b>	<b>We help our partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation opportunities that benefit people, wildlife, and ecosystems.</b>		
<b>Objective 1.A.</b>	<b>Provide leadership to help our partners strategically invest in the protection, restoration, and development of habitat and recreation opportunities. We do this through policy development, coordination, and advocacy.</b>		
<b>Strategies</b>		<b>Activities</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>
Policy Development	Strategy 1.A.1. – Evaluate and develop strategic investment policies and plans so that projects selected for funding meet the state’s recreation and conservation needs.	1. Prioritize, review, and consider new and existing policies. A few of the many possible policies for review include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage investment in passive recreation in natural settings</li> <li>• Fund projects that combine conservation and recreation</li> <li>• Create a small grants program</li> <li>• Provide for urban wildlife habitat</li> <li>• Give preference to new phases and resubmission of previously funded Board projects</li> <li>• Address conversions and matching funds</li> <li>• Address re-appropriations</li> <li>• Implement Level of Service approach</li> </ul>	<p>Prioritization completed and top priority policies addressed.</p> <p>Effect of each policy change planned and measured.</p>
		2. Use SCORP and trend information when making investment decisions.	All grant program evaluation criteria presented for Board consideration include relevant trend information.
Coordination	Strategy 1.A.2. – Develop and coordinate outdoor recreation plans and strategies that look to the future and balance investments across a range of recreational activities.	3. Define an investment strategy for outdoor recreation and land acquisition based on Washington’s needs in the next 25 years and consider ways to balance activities across varying needs in coordination with interested parties and agencies.	Recreation and land acquisition investment strategy adopted and implemented.
		4. Update the state trails plan.	State trails plan updated
	Strategy 1.A.3. – Coordinate recreation resources information and priorities.	5. Work with the Habitat and Recreation Land Coordinating Group to increase coordination of habitat and recreation land acquisitions.	Process developed and implemented.
		6. Host an activity (such as a recreation summit) aimed at creating a 25 year investment strategy and to develop goals for coming decade.	Proposal considered. Activity held.
		7. Develop an online recreation portal to provide the public with one-stop-shopping for recreation information.	Portal proposal considered. Portal developed and launched.

<b>Objective 1.B.</b>	<b>Provide funding to help partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation facilities and lands.</b>		
	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>
Strategic Investment	Strategy 1.B.4. – Provide partners with funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance habitats that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help sustain Washington’s biodiversity;</li> <li>• Protect “listed” species ;</li> <li>• Maintain fully functioning ecosystems;</li> <li>• Protect unique urban wildlife habitats; and</li> <li>• Protect game and non-game wildlife.</li> </ul>	8. Fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process	Projects funded.  Annual report on effect of projects in previous grant cycle(s).
	Strategy 1.B.5. – Provide funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance recreation opportunities statewide, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicycling and walking facilities “close to home”;</li> <li>• Programs that assist with facility operation and maintenance;</li> <li>• Facilities most conducive to improved health;</li> <li>• Outdoor sports facilities, both team and individual;</li> <li>• Programs that provide improved recreation data; and</li> <li>• Nature and natural settings (includes fishing and hunting).</li> </ul>	9. Fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process	Projects funded.  Annual report on effect of projects in previous grant cycle(s).
	Strategy 1.B.6. – Help land management agencies maximize the useful life of Board-funded projects.	10. Evaluate the development and implementation of programs that provide maintenance and operations support and that encourage stewardship.	Proposal considered.

\* Strategies 1.A.5, 1.A.6, and 1.A.7 were combined into new strategy 3.A.4

<b>Goal 2</b>	<b>We achieve a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us. We do this with integrity, efficiency, fairness, and a process that is open to the public.</b>		
<b>Objective 2.A.</b>	<b>Ensure funded projects and programs are managed efficiently, with integrity, in a fair and open manner, and in conformance with existing legal authorities.</b>		
	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>
Policy development	Strategy 2.A.1. – Evaluate and develop policies and practices to reduce the number of projects not starting or finishing on time.	11. Provide policy direction to assist project sponsors in meeting project milestones. This includes clear policies for consequences of failing to meet key milestones, when termination should be considered, phasing, post-completion compliance (e.g., conversions), and other grant management policies. Track and report on success rate.	Progressive increase in number of projects starting and/or finishing on time.
	Strategy 2.A.2. – Regularly monitor progress in meeting objectives and adapt management to meet changing needs.	12. Conduct regular program performance reviews based on legislative and agency policies. Report results to Board and the public.	Annual reports made to the board. Accomplishments presented to public.
Advocacy & Outreach	Strategy 2.A.3. – Ensure the work of the Board and staff is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner.	13. Regularly seek and use public feedback in policy and funding decisions.	Reports presented to Board several time each year, including follow-up actions.
<b>Objective 2.B</b>	<b>Support activities that promote continuous quality improvement.</b>		
	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>
Policy Development	Strategy 2.B.4. – Ensure the Board has time on its agenda for discussing high-level policy issues.	14. Develop annual Board work plan to regularly report on progress toward meeting strategic plan goals.	Plan reviewed annually
		15. Delegate more routine authority to the director.	Consistent progress on agency's annual work plan activities
	Strategy 2.B.5. – Implement a Board member and staff feedback process.	16. Assess board and staff members' feedback on meetings and Board operations.	Board and staff assessments completed annually.

<b>Goal 3</b>	<b>We deliver successful projects by using broad public participation and feedback, monitoring, assessment, and adaptive management.</b>		
<b>Objective 3.A</b>	<b>Broaden public support and applicant pool for the Board's outdoor investment programs.</b>		
	<b>Strategies</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>
Advocacy & Outreach	Strategy 3.A.1. – Expand the Board's support by developing key partnerships.	17. Seek partnerships with other agencies and communities, such as those involved in health, economic development, and local and federal governments.	Prioritize and seek up to two new partnerships.
	Strategy 3.A.2. – Increase the public's understanding of project benefits.	18. Implement the agency's communications plan.	Plan is implemented.
		19. Develop monitoring systems and feedback loops to communicate accomplishments with the public.	Monitoring and feedback systems are developed, and effect is reported to Board.
	Strategy 3.A.3. – Perform regular assessments to determine the public's priorities for outdoor recreation and conservation funding.	20. Survey and integrate public opinion into Board policies and plans.	Continue SCORP assessment of recreation participation.
	Strategy 3.A.4 – Advocate for the protection of habitat and recreation through multiple venues.	21. Engage media on key agency issues.	Provide guest editorials and editorial board visits with the goal of being published twice per year.
		22. Implement recognition program that brings agency representatives to local communities, honors sponsors, generates media coverage.	Five events attended a year.
		23. Attend gatherings of large stakeholder groups.	Attendance at three events a year.
		24. Assess how Board-funded programs promote health, and develop messages and statistics.	Develop method for measuring effect of grants on health of Washington residents.  Messages developed.
	Strategy 3.A.5 – Expand reach of grant programs by broadening applicant pool for grant programs.	25. Increase outreach to eligible applicants by expanding current methods and exploring new outreach activities.	Increase in new applicants and new successful applicants.

		26. Advocate for statewide participation through focused media attention on successful projects in new areas.	Identify potentially under-represented areas and track increase in participation.
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

# Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Strategic Plan

## Mission

Provide leadership and funding to help our partners protect and enhance Washington's natural and recreational resources for current and future generations.

## Goals

1. We help our partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation opportunities that benefit people, fish and wildlife, and ecosystems.
2. We achieve a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us.
3. We deliver successful projects by using broad public participation and feedback, monitoring, assessment, and adaptive management.

## Guiding Principles

Guiding principles are fundamental concepts that form the basis for Board policy.

- Principle 1.** The Board's primary roles are to (1) ensure the best possible investment of funds in protecting and improving habitats, ecosystems, and outdoor recreation opportunities, (2) provide accountability for those investments, and (3) provide citizen oversight to the funding process.
- Principle 2.** Successful protection and improvement of Washington's ecosystems and recreation requires coordination across all levels of government and geographic scales. Decisions and actions should be guided by a statewide perspective coupled with each local community's social, economic, and cultural values and priorities.
- Principle 3.** ~~Federal, state, tribal, and local governments~~ The plans and strategies (conservation and/or recreation) of our partners should help guide the identification and prioritization of projects.

**Principle 4.** Projects must have explicit objectives, as well as appropriate designs and implementation plans to meet those objectives.

**Principle 5.** The Board will continue to work with federal, tribal, state and local agencies, stakeholder organizations and other interested parties to evaluate and improve the funding process. The Board also will continue to ensure that it funds the highest priority projects with integrity and impartiality and provides accountability to the Legislature and the public for that funding.

## Objectives and Strategies

### **Goal 1: We help our partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation opportunities that benefit people, wildlife, and ecosystems.**

#### **Objective 1.A.**

**Provide leadership to help our partners strategically invest in the protection, restoration, and development of habitat and recreation opportunities. We do this through policy development, coordination, and advocacy.**

- Strategy 1.A.1. – Evaluate and develop strategic investment policies and plans so that projects selected for funding meet the state’s recreation and conservation needs.
- Strategy 1.A.2. – ~~Develop and coordinate~~ Gather and interpret data that inform outdoor recreation plans and strategies that look to the future and help the board to provide grant programs that balance investments across a range of ~~recreational~~ activities.
- Strategy 1.A.3. – Coordinate recreation resources information and priorities.

#### **Objective 1.B.**

**Provide funding to help partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation facilities and lands.**

- Strategy 1.B.4. – Provide partners with funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance habitats.
  - For example, this includes projects that help sustain Washington’s biodiversity; protect “listed” species; maintain fully functioning ecosystems; protect unique urban wildlife habitats; and/or protect game and non-game wildlife.
- Strategy 1.B.5. – Provide funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance recreation opportunities statewide.
  - For example, this includes projects such as bicycling and walking facilities ~~“close to home”~~; programs that assist with facility operation and maintenance; facilities most conducive to improved health; outdoor sports facilities, ~~both team and individual~~;



programs that provide improved recreation data; and/or access to nature and natural settings (includes fishing and hunting).

- Strategy 1.B.6. – Help ~~land management agencies~~ sponsors maximize the useful life of board-funded projects.

## **Goal 2: We achieve a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us.**

### **Objective 2.A.**

**Ensure funded projects and programs are managed efficiently, with integrity, in a fair and open manner, and in conformance with existing legal authorities.**

- Strategy 2.A.1. – Evaluate and develop policies and practices to reduce the number of projects not starting or finishing on time.
- Strategy 2.A.2. – Regularly monitor progress in meeting objectives and adapt management to meet changing needs.
- Strategy 2.A.3. – Ensure the work of the Board and staff is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner.

### **Objective 2.B**

**Support activities that promote continuous quality improvement.**

- Strategy 2.B.4. – Ensure the Board has time on its agenda ~~for discussing~~ to discuss high-level policy issues.
- Strategy 2.B.5. – Implement a Board member and staff feedback process.

## **Goal 3: We deliver successful projects by using broad public participation and feedback, monitoring, assessment, and adaptive management.**

### **Objective 3.A**

**Broaden public support and applicant pool for the Board's ~~outdoor investment grant~~ programs.**

- Strategy 3.A.1. – Expand the Board's support by developing key partnerships.
- Strategy 3.A.2. – Increase public understanding of project benefits.
- Strategy 3.A.3. – Perform regular assessments to determine the public's priorities for outdoor recreation and conservation funding.

- Strategy 3.A.4 – Advocate for the protection of habitat and recreation through multiple venues.
- Strategy 3.A.5 – Expand reach of grant programs by broadening applicant pool for grant programs.

## Key Performance Measures

Goal	Framing Question	Measure
We help our partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation opportunities that benefit people, wildlife, and ecosystems.	Is the board creating opportunities for recreation?	Projects funded by type, location
	Is the board protecting natural systems and landscapes?	Acres protected (through acquisition) or restored
	Are we affecting the health of Washingtonians?	Percent of respondents to OFM and statewide recreation surveys reporting participation in active recreation
We achieve a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us.	Is the evaluation process objective and fair?	Percent of applicants reporting that the evaluation is objective and fair
	Are we managing grants efficiently and reducing project delays?	Agency re-appropriation rate
	How well do we maintain the state's investments?	Percent of grants in compliance  {Sustainability measure to be developed with policy}
We deliver successful projects by using broad public participation and feedback, monitoring, assessment, and adaptive management.	Are stakeholders involved in policy development?	Percent of sponsors agreeing with the survey question that "The board considers input before making policy decisions"
	Are we achieving statewide participation in our grant programs?	Number of funded projects by location (e.g., county or other geography)

## Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Fiscal Year 2011 Work Plan

**Goal 1: We help our partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation opportunities that benefit people, wildlife, and ecosystems.**

Objective	Strategy	Fiscal Year 2011 Actions	Approximate Timeframe
Objective 1.A. Provide leadership to help our partners strategically invest in the protection, restoration, and development of habitat and recreation opportunities. We do this through policy development, coordination, and advocacy.	Strategy 1.A.1. – Evaluate and develop strategic investment policies and plans so that projects selected for funding meet the state’s recreation and conservation needs.	Revise acquisition policy manual	June 2010 – June 2011 Most of the work to be completed by January 2011.
		Develop alternative to the Deed of Right	Finish by December 2010
		Update manual 2 (planning) and incorporate lessons learned from testing Level of Service concept	June 2010 – June 2011
		Revise policy regarding matching funds	June 2010 – June 2011
		Revise compatible uses policy	June 2010 – June 2011
		Develop pilot project to help develop policy for water rights acquired with grant funds	Pilot project by June 2011
	<del>Strategy 1.A.2. – Develop and coordinate</del> <u>Gather and interpret data that inform outdoor recreation plans and strategies that look to the future and help the board to provide grant programs that balance investments across a range of recreational activities.</u>	Conduct a statewide recreation survey and report on results, subject to funding (see also Strategy 3.A.3.)	Preparation only; Subject to funding in 2011 – 13 biennial budget
		Conduct surveys of sponsors and applicants	June 2010; September 2010; June 2011
	Strategy 1.A.3. – Coordinate recreation resources information and priorities.	Work with the Habitat and Recreation Land Coordinating Group to increase coordination of habitat and recreation land acquisitions	December 2010: Annual report to OFM  July 2011: Annual State Land Acquisition Coordinating Forum.

Objective	Strategy	Fiscal Year 2011 Actions	Approximate Timeframe
Objective 1.B. Provide funding to help partners protect, restore, and develop habitat and recreation facilities and lands.	Strategy 1.B.4. – Provide partners with funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance habitats.	Conduct grant cycles for WWRP and ALEA	June 2010 – June 2011
	Strategy 1.B.5. – Provide funding to protect, preserve, restore, and enhance recreation opportunities statewide.	Conduct grant cycles for funded programs, such as BFP, BIG, FARR, LWCF, NOVA, and WWRP.	June 2010 – June 2011
	Strategy 1.B.6. – Help <del>land-management agencies</del> <u>sponsors</u> <u>maximize</u> the useful life of Board-funded projects.	Assess whether (and potentially how) to encourage greater use of sustainable practices in grant programs	June 2010 – June 2011

**Goal 2: We achieve a high level of accountability in managing the resources and responsibilities entrusted to us.**

Objective	Strategy	Fiscal Year 2011 Actions	Approximate Timeframe
Objective 2.A. Ensure funded projects and programs are managed efficiently, with integrity, in a fair and open manner, and in conformance with existing legal authorities.	Strategy 2.A.1. – Evaluate and develop policies and practices to reduce the number of projects not starting or finishing on time, <u>or that are out of compliance with the contract terms.</u>	Apply existing compliance policies to new and funded projects	Ongoing
		Develop additional policies to support compliance efforts (e.g., streamline process for small conversions, self-certification and audits, etc.)	June 2010 – June 2011
	Strategy 2.A.2. – Regularly monitor progress in meeting objectives and adapt management to meet changing needs.	Conduct annual performance review of Director	August – October 2010
		Receive regular performance updates	Each meeting
Objective 2.B	Strategy 2.A.3. – Ensure the work of the Board and staff is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner.	Conduct surveys of sponsors and applicants	June 2010 September 2010 June 2011
	Strategy 2.B.4. – Ensure the Board has	Discuss and develop sustainability policies for major	March 2010 – July 2011

Objective	Strategy	Fiscal Year 2011 Actions	Approximate Timeframe
Support activities that promote continuous quality improvement.	time on its agenda <del>to discuss for</del> discussing high-level policy issues.	grant programs	
	Strategy 2.B.5. – Implement a Board member and staff feedback process.	Conduct annual survey of board members as part of the Director's evaluation	August – October 2010

**Goal 3: We deliver successful projects by using broad public participation and feedback, monitoring, assessment, and adaptive management.**

Objective	Strategy	Fiscal Year 2011 Actions	Approximate Timeframe
Objective 3.A Broaden public support and applicant pool for the Board's outdoor investment programs.	Strategy 3.A.1. – Expand the Board's support by developing key partnerships.	Seek partnerships with other agencies, <u>organizations, tribes, and communities</u> , such as those involved in health <u>and</u> economic development, <del>and local and federal governments.</del>	Ongoing
	Strategy 3.A.2. – Increase public understanding of project benefits.	Update and begin to implement the agency's communication plan	December 2010
	Strategy 3.A.3. – Perform regular assessments to determine the public's priorities for outdoor recreation and conservation funding.	Conduct a statewide recreation survey and report on results, subject to funding	Preparation only; Subject to funding in 2011 – 13 biennial budget
	Strategy 3.A.4 – Advocate for the protection of habitat and recreation through multiple venues.	Attend gatherings of large stakeholder groups and/or public ceremonies recognizing projects.	Ongoing
		Engage the media to help advocate for board programs through media tours, news releases, editorial boards, guest editorials, and other mechanisms.	Ongoing
	Strategy 3.A.5 – Expand reach of grant programs by broadening applicant pool for grant programs.	Increase outreach to eligible applicants by expanding current methods and exploring new outreach activities.	Ongoing

Natural Resources Building  
P.O. Box 40917  
Olympia, WA 98504-0917

1111 Washington St. S.E.  
Olympia, WA 98501




**STATE OF WASHINGTON**  
**RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE**

Item 7D  
(360) 902-3000  
TTY: (360) 902-1996  
Fax: (360) 902-3026

E-mail: [Info@rco.wa.gov](mailto:Info@rco.wa.gov)  
Web site: [www.rco.wa.gov](http://www.rco.wa.gov)

To: Recreation and Conservation Funding Board

From: Bill Chapman, Chair 

Subject: Revised Director Evaluation process

Date: May 12, 2010

Following our evaluation of the Director last fall, we discussed more closely linking the Director's evaluation to the strategic plan, the work plan, and performance measures established for each year and biennium. We discussed changing the timing, so that recommendations come in a timely manner, rather than mid-way through the fiscal year.

In response, staff have proposed the following approach to the timing of the evaluation so as to line up with the development of the strategic plan, work plan updates, and the biennial budget. Mid-fall is a good time for the evaluation because it allows time for staff to finish the fiscal year and assess performance. But, the process needs to start earlier in the budget development process for the next biennium, which begins in the late spring nearly a year in advance. So, this June we need to set expectations for the next fiscal year and the following biennium. We will have the opportunity to adjust those every year, if necessary. In the fall of each year, the evaluation would assess performance and/or progress towards the expectations set for the previous year.

### **Proposed Process**

1. At the June 25 board meeting, the board will approve the work plan and performance measures for the upcoming year and subsequent biennium. Staff will present a draft for board consideration at the June board meeting.
2. Also at the June meeting, the chair will appoint a subcommittee (the chair and two board members) to work over the late summer and early fall to review the previous year's expectations, feedback, and performance data. Comments by board members suggested that the two appointed roles should rotate among the board members.



3. During the late summer, the director will submit a self-assessment of her performance to the board chair. This self assessment will be based on the previous fiscal year's performance measures. The self-assessment will include:
  - A discussion of appropriate metrics and any trends, issues, or opportunities illustrated by those metrics
  - An Identification of her priorities for the next year, including any suggestions on ways to measure her performance in the next year's evaluation.
4. The chair will work with the human resources manager to compile the following information for the subcommittee:
  - Previous year's agency and board work plans with performance measures and data;
  - Performance expectations for the director;
  - Current strategic plans for the agency and board;
  - Director's job description; and
  - List of individuals to contact for feedback. In the past, RCO has requested feedback from board members, chairs of other RCO-supported boards and councils, and key stakeholders about the performance of the director.
5. The subcommittee will meet during the early fall to develop a written summary of the director's performance.
6. In executive session during the first board meeting following the close of the fiscal year, the board will discuss the results of the subcommittee's gathered information and reach a conclusion on the director's performance for the preceding year.
7. In the same executive session, the board will present its findings to the director with an opportunity for response.
8. The chair will then verbally discuss the results of the performance evaluation with our designated liaison in the Governor's office.

**Item 8**

Meeting Date: June 2010  
Title: Preparing for the 2011 Legislative Session  
Prepared By: Steve McLellan, Policy Director

Approved by the Director:

---

**Proposed Action: Briefing**

## Summary

This memo provides an overview of the decisions that the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) will need to make for the 2011 legislative session. These decisions include agency request legislation and budget requests.

## Legislation for 2011

The Office of Financial Management (OFM) issued guidance for proposed agency request legislation in early May.

- Agency request legislation that does not have a fiscal impact is due September 24. Stakeholder work must be completed before the agency submits the request.
- Request legislation that has a state or local government fiscal impact will be due with the budget requests. We do not yet have that timeline from OFM but expect it to be in early September. It is important to note that indications from the Governor's Office and OFM are that legislative requests with fiscal impacts face a very difficult approval process because of an approximately \$3 billion shortfall in the general fund for the 2011-13 biennium.

We expect the major activity for the 2011 session will be explaining and advocating for the agency capital and operating budget requests. Also, as noted in Item #2e, staff is developing possible request legislation for community gardens. Community gardens are allowed activities in the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Local Parks category grant programs. It may be desirable to develop a stand-alone grant program for community gardens that could be activated should federal or other funds become available.

In addition, the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) is planning legislative requests to extend the Monitoring Forum and Invasive Species Council, both of which are scheduled to sunset in 2011.



## Operating and Capital Budget Requests for 2011-13

The RCO will receive initial budget guidance from the Office of Financial Management (OFM) in June and expects that we will need to submit our 2011-13 biennial budget requests in early September. We anticipate substantial changes in the framework for the budget analysis, with an increased focus on which government services should be supported by general tax revenues, which are more appropriately supported by fees, and which should be turned over to the private or non-profit sectors.

The board will meet on August 20 via conference call to approve its budget request. As shown in the table below, some of the agency requests will be based on fund revenue projections, some will be based on expected federal funds, and others are requests for general funds or bond funds. The RCO plans to request full restoration of the Nonhighway Off-Road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) and Boating Facilities Program (BFP) funds that were reprogrammed to other agencies in the 2009-11 biennium.

To prepare for the August board decision, staff will ask the board to provide initial guidance for developing capital budget requests for WWRP, the Boating Activities Program, and the Youth Athletic Facilities Program.

		Appropriation	
Source		07-09	09-11
<b>STATE PROGRAMS</b>			
<b>Programs for which the board requests a funding level</b>			
Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program (WWRP)	Bonds	100,000,000	70,000,000
Boating Activities Program	GFS (Operating)	2,000,000	0
Youth Athletic Facilities Program (YAF)	Donation/Interest, Bonds	2,500,000	0
<b>Programs for which budget is based on revenue projections</b>			
Aquatic Lands Enhancement Program (ALEA)	Sales/Bonds	5,025,000	5,025,000
Boating Facilities Program (BFP)	Tax/Fees	8,021,000	\$0
Firearms and Archery Range Recreation Program (FARR)	Tax/Fees	472,000	495,000
Nonhighway, Off-Road Vehicle Program (NOVA)	Tax/Fees	9,036,000	0
<b>Subtotal, State Programs</b>		<b>127,054,000</b>	<b>75,520,000</b>
<b>FEDERAL PROGRAMS</b> <i>(spending authority is sought based on potential federal appropriation)</i>			
Boating Infrastructure Grant Program (BIG)	Federal	200,000	1,000,000
Land & Water Conservation Fund Program (LWCF)	Federal	1,000,000	4,000,000
Recreational Trail Program (RTP)	Federal	3,500,000	4,000,000
<b>Subtotal, Federal Programs</b>		<b>4,700,000</b>	<b>9,000,000</b>
<b>RCFB Grant Program Totals</b>		<b>131,754,000</b>	<b>84,520,000</b>

## Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Funding for WWRP was doubled to \$100 million in 2007, after being near the \$50 million level since 1989. As shown in the table below, the board requested \$100 million for 2009-11, the governor approved a request of \$50 million, and the legislature ultimately approved \$70 million.

Biennium	Board Request	Governor's Budget	Legislative Appropriation
05-07	\$60 million	\$45 million	\$50 million
07-09	\$100 million	\$70 million	\$100 million
09-11	\$100 million	\$50 million	\$70 million

Sustaining recent levels of investment will depend on the state's bonding capacity and our ability to compete for bond funding. It is likely that there will be few new capital budget resources available because the debt limit will restrict bonding capacity. Also, there will be continued pressure to allocate a portion of capital budget resources to assist with the projected operating budget shortfall.

For the upcoming grant round, the RCO has received 269 grant applications for WWRP totaling \$189 million. The following table shows three funding scenarios and the resulting distribution to the eleven funding categories, as well as the current requests by category. Staff will provide an updated list of the funding requests in August.

Dollars in millions	--- Funding Levels ---			Request to Date
	\$50 mil.	\$70 mil	\$100 mil	
Habitat Conservation Account				
Critical Habitat	\$9.2	\$11.8	\$14.0	\$25.10
Natural Area	\$6.1	\$7.9	\$10.5	\$22.00
Urban Wildlife	\$4.1	\$5.2	\$7.0	\$22.50
State Lands Restoration	\$1.0	\$1.3	\$3.5	\$4.10
Subtotal	\$20.4	\$26.2	\$34.9	\$73.70
Outdoor Recreation Account				
State Parks	\$6.1	\$7.9	\$10.5	\$12.30
Local Parks	\$6.1	\$7.9	\$10.5	\$30.30
Trails	\$4.1	\$5.2	\$7.0	\$21.80
Water Access	\$3.1	\$3.9	\$5.2	\$8.50
State Lands Development	\$1.0	\$1.3	\$1.7	\$4.30
Subtotal	\$20.4	\$26.2	\$34.9	\$77.20
Riparian Protection Account	\$3.9	\$9.7	\$18.4	\$23.90
Farmlands Preservation Account	\$3.9	\$5.8	\$8.7	\$13.70
Administration	\$1.5	\$2.3	\$3.0	n/a
Total	\$50.0	\$70.0	\$100.0	\$188.5

## Boating Activities Program

In 2001, the legislature created the Boating Activities Program, which provides funds for State Parks and RCO boating activities grants. The legislature appropriated \$2 million from the General Fund for the 2007-09 biennium, but OFM did not carry the program forward into the base budget for 2009-2011. The board requested, but did not receive, funding for the program in the current biennium. In August, the board will need to decide whether to request funds for the upcoming biennium. The funding for this has been from the general fund, which, as noted above, is expected to have an approximately \$3 billion shortfall.

## Youth Athletic Facilities

The Youth Athletic Facilities grant program was created with a one-time \$10 million contribution as part of the initiative to build Qwest Field. It was intended that the program would receive ongoing support from surplus funds remaining after the repayment of stadium bonds. To date, no surplus funds have come into the account.

The program received a special capital budget bond appropriation in the 2007-09 biennium. That appropriation was not carried forward into the 2009-11 biennium. The board needs to decide if it will request an appropriation in this budget cycle.

**June 2010****Project Itinerary**

- 9:30 a.m. Meet at the lobby of the Holiday Inn Express and Suites Richland (1970 Center Parkway, Richland, WA 99352)**
- 9:45 a.m. Depart from the hotel**  
Directions from the hotel to Clover Island are at the end of this memo.
- 10:00 a.m. Meet at Clover Island**  
Sacagawea Heritage Trail  
Columbia Park  
Hanford Reach Gateway Dock
- 12:30 p.m. Tour concludes**  
Lunch is on your own. Please leave the Tri-Cities area no later than 2 p.m. to ensure that you arrive in Walla Walla by 3:15 p.m. for the meeting with the State Parks Commission

**Project Details****Site #1: Clover Island, Port of Kennewick**

The board funded two projects at Clover Island. The first replaced the guest moorage, improving safety and making it accessible to people with disabilities. The marina is the only publicly owned marina in the area, which has more than 10,000 registered boats. The second, which is still in active status, will restore shoreline habitat for salmon and develop a meandering, riverfront pathway along Clover Island's perimeter. Work will include adding benches, railings, and renovated viewpoints along the Columbia River and creating sidewalks to the island's boat dock that are accessible to people with disabilities. Crews will improve the river habitat for salmon by planting native plants along the river's banks. The pathway will link the island to the regional Sacagawea Heritage Trail and will accommodate activities such as walking, bicycling, and skating.

Name	Fund	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Clover Island Marina Replacement	Boating Facilities Program	3/1/2007	\$144,339	\$577,356	\$721,695	Closed Complete
Clover Island Improvement Project	Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account	8/24/2009	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	Active

## Site #2: Sacagawea Heritage Trail, Kennewick Parks & Recreation Department

The first project involved development of 1.6 miles of a 12 foot wide meandering regional trail and amenities along the Columbia River on top of the riverfront U.S. Army Corps levee. Work on the levee created several additional acres of usable open space suitable for future park development. The second grant helped to develop 10 acres along a 12-foot-wide, meandering, riverfront regional trail and provided trail amenities such as benches, picnic tables, a basketball court and a drinking fountain.

The trail serves all age groups and supports activities such as walking, bicycling, skating, jogging, bird watching, pet walking, along with all the recreational activities on the water.

Name	Grant Program	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Sacagawea Trail/ Riverfront Improvements	Land and Water Conservation Fund	10/23/2006	\$238,801	\$266,770	\$505,571	Closed Complete
Sacagawea Heritage Trail		11/1/2004	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,500,000	

## Site #3: Columbia Park

Columbia Park is a 380-acre regional waterfront park. The board has funded many projects at the park through several grant programs. The tour will stop at the aquatic playground, which includes a community picnic and water-play recreation feature in the east end. The project included remodeling an existing restroom to code; constructing a group picnic shelter, horseshoe court, trail segment to connect to a riverfront trail, zero-depth aquatic spray playground, and related amenities. The features are in a 15-acre family use area, adjacent to a family fishing pond, play structure, and improved parking.

Name	Grant Program	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Columbia Park Aquatic Playground	WWRP Local Parks	8/1/2001	\$265,265	\$265,265	\$530,531	Closed Complete

## Site #4: Hanford Reach Gateway Dock

This project was designed to meet the transient moorage and shore service needs of large recreational vessels on the Columbia River in southeastern Washington. The site has restrooms,


showers, picnic shelters and shade trees. It is within walking distance of restaurants, museums, entertainment, hotels and services. The project included a 150-foot moorage dock with shore access by an ADA accessible ramp. Other elements are utilities, informational kiosks, interpretive signage about the history, ecology, and geology of the Columbia River, and dock amenities such as lighting, seating and tie-ups.

Name	Type	Start Date	Grant Amount	Match	Total Cost	Status
Hanford Reach Gateway Dock	Boating Infrastructure Grant	9/30/2002	\$254,915	\$336,053	\$590,968	Closed Complete

### Directions from Hotel to Clover Island Marina

The Holiday Inn Express and Suites Richland is at 1970 Center Parkway, Richland, WA 99352. We are meeting at the Clover Island Marina, which is about 300 Clover Island Drive. The drive is 6.5 miles and should take about 10 minutes.

- Head east on Tapteal Dr
- Take the 1st right toward N Belfair Pl
- Take the 1st left onto N Belfair Pl
- Turn left at W Arrowhead Ave
- Continue onto N Columbia Center Blvd
- Merge onto WA-240 E via the ramp to Kennewick
- Take the exit toward W Columbia Dr
- Keep left at the fork to continue toward W Columbia Dr
- Keep left at the fork to continue toward W Columbia Dr
- Turn right at W Columbia Dr
- Turn left at N Washington St
- Continue onto Clover Is/Clover Island Dr



## RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA AND ACTIONS, JUNE 25, 2010

---

### Agenda Items without Formal Action

Item	Board Request for Follow-up ( <i>Due Date in Italics</i> )
Management Report	<p>The board asked Kaleen to send a copy of the memo to Rep. Kretz and offer to meet with him. (<i>June – completed</i>)</p> <p>The board wants to ensure that they have time at a future meeting to discuss the options and identify the approach they want to take for developing a grant program for community gardens. (<i>2011 schedule</i>)</p>
Acquisition Policy Updates and Potential Changes	Staff should proceed with the work as planned, and provide a briefing in August. ( <i>August</i> )
Request for Board Guidance: City of Kent Stormwater Proposal	If the city of Kent wants to proceed, they need to return with more detailed information. Staff needs to provide more information about how the funding sources affect the policy and decision.
Performance Review and Board Work Plan	<p>The board requested edits to the strategic plan and work plan (Summer – completed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rewrite Principle #3 to read “The plans and strategies (conservation and/or recreation) of federal, state, tribal, local government, and other partners should help guide the identification and prioritization of projects.”</li><li>• Put the phrase “close to home” back into Strategy 1.B.5.</li><li>• Add the revision to the conversion policy (in the agency work plan) to the board work plan.</li></ul>
Preparing for the 2011 Legislative Session	The board did not request legislation for 2011. Staff should proceed with 2011-13 budget development, with a board decision in August. ( <i>August</i> )

### Agenda Items with Formal Action

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up ( <i>Due Date in Italics</i> )
Consent Calendar	<a href="#">Approved</a>	
Boating Infrastructure Grants: Request to Delegate Authority to Director	<a href="#">Approved</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Delegated authority to the director to submit Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for federal fiscal year 2011</li></ul>	Report the final project ranking and the projects sent for federal consideration ( <i>October</i> )
Conversion Request: City of Newcastle, May Creek Trail Addition, RCO #91-211	<a href="#">Rejected</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Conversion request was denied, pending further board discussion of conversion policy.</li></ul>	<p>Staff to research and report on the board’s current authority regarding conversions</p> <p>Newcastle request to be considered at future meeting (<i>possibly October</i>)</p>

## RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

---

Date: June 25, 2010

Place: Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, Washington

### Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

<b>Bill Chapman, Chair</b>	Mercer Island	<b>Stephen Saunders</b>	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
<b>Steven Drew</b>	Olympia	<b>Rex Derr</b>	Director, State Parks and Recreation
<b>Jeff Parsons</b>	Leavenworth	<b>Dave Brittell</b>	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
<b>Harriet Spanel</b>	Bellingham		
<b>Karen Daubert</b>	Seattle		

**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.**

---

Thursday, June 24, 2010

### Joint Meeting with the State Parks Commission

Fred Olson and Bill Chapman made opening remarks, welcoming the board members for the first joint meeting between the two boards. Board members then participated in an extensive discussion of the ways in which they could promote greater sustainability in their work. Members of both boards noted the various approaches, environmental and cost trade-offs, and the importance of sharing information among agencies and project sponsors as this dynamic field evolves. Key points included:

- Policy development should proceed simply and slowly, with careful consideration to unintended consequences. The first step should be policy statements, without changes to evaluation criteria.
- Any policy should prioritize incentives rather than requirements. However, incentives should not penalize good projects where sustainable approaches are impractical or too costly. Proven technologies should be prioritized over newer practices. The cost and location of the materials are also elements of sustainability.
- Lowering the long-term costs should be weighed against initial cost savings.

Board members agreed that the discussion was valuable. They agreed to hold additional joint sessions either annually or biennially, with topics to be determined in the future.



Friday, June 25, 2010

## **Opening and Management Report**

Chair Bill Chapman called the meeting to order at 8:38 a.m. Staff called roll, and a quorum was determined.

- The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) approved the agenda as presented.
- The board reviewed Revised Resolution #2010-09, Consent Calendar.

**Resolution 2010-09 moved by: Derr                      and seconded by: Daubert**  
**Resolution APPROVED**

Representative Maureen Walsh welcomed the board to Walla Walla. She discussed recreation and conservation projects and efforts in the area, in particular those related to salmon recovery.

### Item 2: Management Report

RCO Director Kaleen Cottingham reviewed her management report. In particular, she noted the state audit findings and discussed the changes that the agency has made, and reviewed a memo that she wrote to the board about the agency's response. She assured the board that the agency has not paid for items that the state did not receive, and that we have systems in place, including a risk-based approach to sponsor audits. Kaleen also noted that we are improving those systems and moving to performance based contracts. She concluded by explaining the circumstances related to the grants that were audited. Rachael Langen noted that the mitigation plan had been delivered to OFM for approval on Wednesday June 23.

The board discussed ways to respond to clear the record and whether any further action is needed. They also noted that there are a number of things that were not found in the audit – and that the programs are fundamentally sound. The board asked Kaleen to send a copy of the memo to Rep. Kretz and offer to meet with him. The board also encouraged the RCO to complete its mitigation plan.

Kaleen also noted performance metrics and the expiration of the Biodiversity Council. Rex noted the hard work of the RCO to close the Kiket Island project.

### Summary of 2010 Supplemental Budget Impacts

Steve McLellan, policy director, reviewed the legislative session and supplemental budget effects as described in the staff memo.

### Grant Management Report

Section managers Marguerite Austin and Scott Robinson reviewed the information in the grant management memo. They discussed project review and evaluation, noting that the review teams included over 100 volunteers from throughout the state. Scott also noted that three interns are currently doing inspections for LWCF and boating grants to help reduce the backlog of inspections due. Marguerite discussed projects that received alternate funding, highlighted the Seahurst Park project in Burien and the Mount Vernon Kiwanis Park, and discussed the final report that staff are developing in PRISM.

### Policy Update

In response to board questions at the March meeting, Steve McLellan, policy director, explained that community gardens are eligible in two programs and that the board has funded eight as part of other projects. The agency is authorized to participate in federal grant programs, so new legislation would not be needed if a federal community garden grant program were created. In response to questions from board member Drew, Steve gave further information about the Department of Health community garden grants. Board member Parsons suggested that there be additional outreach for stand-alone community garden projects. Steve noted that we are working to develop the partnership with the DOH. Board member Drew noted that the board would need to think about the definition, scope, and criteria for community gardens. Chair Chapman reminded the board that staff is still seeking funds and that there was a good discussion at the last meeting. Steve noted that there are many moving parts, and that we need to figure out the board's role in the broad scope. The board wants to ensure that they have time at a future meeting to discuss the options and identify the approach they want to take for developing a grant program.

Steve also noted the natural resources reform effort. We are participating in three activities – one front door web access; streamlining grant and loan processes; and building the natural resources GMAP system.

### **Board Decisions**

The board took action on two topics, as follows.

#### Item 3: Boating Infrastructure Grants: Request to Delegate Authority to Director

Section Manager Marguerite Austin explained the circumstance that led staff to ask the board to delegate authority to the director to forward the list of eligible Washington State BIG projects to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

**Resolution 2010-10 moved by: Derr                      and seconded by: Parsons**  
**Resolution APPROVED**

Item 5: Conversion Request: City of Newcastle, May Creek Trail Addition, RCO #91-211

Grant manager Laura Moxham explained the background and current circumstances surrounding the city of Newcastle's request for approval of a conversion of about 2.5 acres of the May Creek Trail Addition project. The city proposes to replace this property with about 1.1 acres of similar property.

In response to questions from board members, Laura and Newcastle Parks Manager Michael Holly provided the following additional information:

- The replacement property was purchased to satisfy the conversion.
- The replacement and conversion properties were appraised at an R-1 value, as if the retention pond were not there. The conversion property appraisal was done in April 2009; the replacement property was appraised in September 2008. The board expressed concern about the dates of the appraisals, given market changes.
- The trail will not cross private property to provide a crossing to Coal Creek Parkway because there is a new stoplight crossing.
- The city has control over the road and path near the surface water pond. There was no change in ownership to the school district; only a change in use.

The board discussed the request at length, expressing dismay that the conversion happened without board approval and noting the following concerns:

- Would approval set a precedent such that sponsors assume they can put stormwater ponds in RCO-funded parks?
- Are there financial or other penalties that the board can use to discourage sponsors from converting properties without prior approval?
- Could the requirements for conversions be higher if there is clear willful non-compliance from the sponsor?
- Does the board have a way to require that converted properties not be developed further, even after a deed restriction is removed through the conversion process?
- Can the board recoup revenue generated from the property prior to the conversion (e.g., sale of timber)?
- Is there a system through which the warnings and penalties could be progressively applied based on the severity of the conversion or situation?

Kaleen Cottingham, Marguerite Austin, and Scott Robinson provided the following information to the board:

- Staff is working on ways to ensure that sponsors know the rules, especially as their staff changes over time.

- The board does not currently have the authority to levy fines or receive payments. Requesting repayment of the grant would create a revolving loan fund.
- Staff has discovered a number of conversions during inspections. They expect to find more as inspections continue.
- One option for penalties would be to amend the existing high-risk policy to include sponsors that have conversions that were not approved by the board. Staff suggested that the policy should not be retroactive.

Michael Holly noted that the city would be willing to keep the deed restriction on the converted property, as well as the replacement property.

**Resolution 2010-11 moved by: Derr and seconded by: Saunders**

**Amended as follows:**

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board expresses its concern with this conversion because it of its failure to respect the grant process. The board reluctantly approves the conversion request and the proposed replacement site for RCO Project #91-211A May Creek Trail Addition, and**

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the board authorizes the director to execute the necessary amendments, including retaining the deed of right on the converted property, and**

**Resolution FAILED 3-5**

**Members Derr, Chapman, and Saunders voted in favor; Members Brittell, Drew, Parsons, Spanel, and Daubert opposed the resolution.**

The board noted that this is part of a broader discussion. They directed staff to research and report on its current authority regarding conversions. The city should not take further action on the conversion until after that discussion.

## **Briefings**

### Item 4: Acquisition Policy Updates and Potential Changes

Grant manager Leslie Ryan-Connelly explained that RCO staff is working on updates and revisions to Manual #3: *Acquiring Lands*. Changes will include clarifying procedures; ensuring consistency with other laws and rules; incorporating board-approved policies; and revising existing policy. She explained the different approval processes for procedural changes versus significant policy changes, and gave examples of both. Leslie concluded by describing the timeline and next steps for the process.

Board member Stephen Saunders made the following comments:

- RCO staff should check with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) transactions team on how they do the work and how they have considered the issues.
- DNR is still working on moving to yellow book for appraisals, but found that few appraisers have yellow book certification. Training is difficult to access.
- Having landowner acknowledgment at the time of application could be a challenge because they are applying for large “envelopes” that could have over 100 owners. Leslie noted that they might need a different approach for landscape-scale projects.

There were no other board comments.

Item 6: Request for Board Guidance: City of Kent Stormwater Proposal RCO #04-1143 (Clark Lake Park Expansion 04)

Grant manager Karl Jacobs described the background and circumstances regarding the city of Kent’s proposal to use a portion of Clark Lake Park for off-site stormwater detention and treatment. The proposed stormwater pond is designed to have both ecological and passive recreational benefits to the park. Staff is asking the board to provide direction on whether the proposal (a) is a bona fide recreational amenity or (b) constitutes a conversion.

The board commended the city for bringing the proposal to the board before proceeding. However, they noted that the proposal lacks details and forces the board to make assumptions. The city should have a more complete, specific proposal, and a formal study that demonstrates that the work improves the park and/or is a real enhancement of the wetland. The board noted that the original intent was to mitigate stormwater, not to improve the lake. The scale of the pond in relation to the overall park also is a significant factor in a future decision. Finally, the board noted that the funding source (state versus federal) could affect their decision because of the different policies at the federal level. Based on the information available, several board members were inclined to consider this a conversion.

The board also discussed the general idea of using parks for off-site stormwater mitigation. Members noted concern that the intent of such proposals is usually mitigation cost savings, not park enhancement. They want to be certain that their decisions do not set a precedent that encourages sponsors to use parks for stormwater.

#### Item 7: Performance Review and Board Work Plan

Rebecca Connolly, Board Liaison and Accountability Manager, presented information about agency performance and the agency's updated strategic plan. She also asked the board to consider changes to its own strategic plan and to adopt a fiscal year 2011 work plan. The board asked for the following revisions:

- Rewrite Principle #3 to read "The plans and strategies (conservation and/or recreation) of federal, state, tribal, local government, and other partners should help guide the identification and prioritization of projects."
- Put the phrase "close to home" back into Strategy 1.B.5.
- Add the revision to the conversion policy (in the agency work plan) to the board work plan.

Member Drew moved to adopt the strategic plan and work plan with these edits. Member Dauber seconded the motion. Motion passed.

#### Item 7D: Deliverables for Director's Evaluation and Process Discussion

Chair Chapman briefed the board on the director evaluation process and asked for volunteers for the subcommittee. Subcommittee members will be Bill Chapman, Steven Drew, and Harriet Spanel.

#### Item 8: Preparing for the 2011 Legislative Session

Policy director Steve McLellan explained the decisions that the board will need to make in August regarding budget, and the legislative decision packages that the RCO will put forward regarding the Monitoring Forum and Invasive Species Council. The board indicated support for continuing both bodies.

McLellan also explained the new budget process, noting that the RCO will need to answer a number of questions. The board asked staff to provide the following information at the August meeting:

- The justification that the RCO will provide with the budget request
- Logic and strategy behind different WWRP funding levels
- Information from statewide sessions
- Recommendation on what we need versus the anticipated funding

The board recommended the following key messages for the agency, noting that these will be considered as they make their decision in August.

- Need to show the impact of lost momentum and staffing
- Need to respect partners and keep the momentum of programs that have just started.

**\*\* DRAFT \*\***

- Demonstrate what we bought over the years and the public benefit.
- Tie to jobs and economic stimulus

#### State Agency Partner Reports

Board member Brittell reported that the Department of Fish and Wildlife is trying to do a better job of managing lands and communicating what they do. They are asking for operations and maintenance dollars in the next session.

Board member Saunders reported that the Department of Natural Resources also is hearing that they need to do a better job of managing lands that they own. They rely heavily on volunteers. He also raised the issue of making costs for activities that support the grant program eligible for reimbursement. These activities include training, supervision, and so on.

**Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.**

Approved by:

---

Bill Chapman, Chair

---

Date