

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: October 24, 2023

Place: Site Tour – Jefferson and Clallam Counties

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members:

Ted Willhite, Chair	Seattle	Shiloh Burgess	Wenatchee
Trang Lam	Camas	Kristen Ohlson-Kiehn	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Michael Shiosaki	Seattle	Amy Windrope	Designee, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Kitty Craig	Seattle	Peter Herzog	Designee; Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission

This summary is to be used with the materials provided in advance of the meeting. The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) retains a recording as the formal record of the meeting.

Call to Order:

The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) met at the Northwest Maritime Center in Port Townsend, Washington where **Chair Willhite** called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM and **Julia McNamara**, Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) Board Liaison, performed roll call, determining quorum. Member Ohlson-Kiehn was absent for the full meeting day. Member Windrope was absent at the time of roll call, but arrived at the second tour location, Dungeness Recreation Area, at 11:00 a.m.

Motion: Move to Approve **October 24-25** Agenda

Moved By: Member **Burgess**

Seconded by: Member **Shiosaki**

Decision: **Approved**

Tour:

Members of the board and staff were welcomed to Port Townsend by the City Manager, John Mauro. The group then embarked on a tour throughout the Northern Olympic Peninsula's Jefferson and Clallam Counties to view board funded projects.

RECESS: 4:40 PM

The meeting was recessed at Fort Worden State Park and members returned to the Northwest Maritime Center in Port Townsend.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: October 25, 2023

Place: Travel Meeting – Northwest Maritime Center, 431 Water St, Port Townsend, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members:

Ted Willhite, Chair	Seattle	Shiloh Burgess	Wenatchee
Trang Lam	Camas	Kristen Ohlson-Kiehn	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Michael Shiosaki	Seattle	Amy Windrope	Designee, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Kitty Craig	Seattle	Peter Herzog	Designee; Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission

This summary is to be used with the materials provided in advance of the meeting. The Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) retains a recording as the formal record of the meeting.

Call to Order:

Chair Willhite called the second day of the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) meeting to order at 9:00 AM and **Julia McNamara**, Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) Board Liaison, performed roll call, determining quorum.

Item 1: Consent Agenda

Chair Willhite invited the board to review and discuss the proposed 2024 Meeting Calendar.

Motion: Move to **Approve 2024 Meeting Schedule**

Moved By: Member **Ohlson-Kiehn**

Seconded by: Member **Lam**

Decision: **Approved**

It was noted that the 2024 travel meeting will likely be in July.

Chair Willhite introduced himself and invited members of the board to introduce themselves for the public joining online.

Chair Willhite introduced the consent agenda, which includes the June 27-28, 2023, meeting minutes and six-time extensions.

Motion: Move to Approve **Resolution 2023-25**, Consent Agenda
Moved By: Member **Herzog**
Seconded by: Member **Shiosaki**
Decision: **Approved**

Item 2: Director's Report

RCO Director Megan Duffy updated the board on staffing changes, introducing Russell Malburg, the newest Recreation and Conservation Outdoor Grants Manager. RCO is in the process of interviewing for the new Equity Coordinator position and working with the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) on recruiting a Tribal Affairs Director. Additionally, RCO received administrative funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) for a compliance focused Outdoor Grants Manager and improvements to the RCO PRISM database, including the automatic notification of long-term grant obligations.

Director Duffy highlighted the fifty-nine vacant spots on RCO advisory committees for next year's grant round for which RCO has received over 130 applications at the time of the meeting. Notably, RCO has adopted a conflict-of-interest policy regarding advisory committee members, which will require members to work with staff to recuse themselves in the event there is a potential or perceived conflict of interest.

Legislative Update

Brock Milliern, Policy and Legislative Director, briefly notified the board of a policy issue concerning the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) – Urban Wildlife Habitat Category. In 2019, the board updated the eligibility criteria of projects for funding to include urban clusters, which expanded the eligibility to around six communities across the state. The designation of urban clusters dates from the 1950s and there was confidence that it would remain a designation; however, it is now being removed. The designation will continue to be used during the 2024 grant round. Over the next year, the policy team will create options for a new definition or concept for the 2026 grant round to allow these communities to remain eligible.

Mr. Milliern provided a legislative update, highlighting three capital requests including \$150,000 to update the Economic Impact Study that was last updated in April 2020; Local Parks Maintenance (LPM) fund transfer; and \$5.78 million for the Community Forest Program (CFP). Regarding the LPM fund transfer, Mr. Milliern clarified that this is new, one-time \$5 million funding provided through the operating budget that allots half to be used in the first year of funding and half to be used in the second year. RCO will ask that some of the first fiscal year funding be transferred to the second fiscal year.

Additionally, RCO has requested \$20 million for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), and nearly \$8 million for the Washington Coastal Restoration and Resiliency Initiative (WCRRI).

Budgets were submitted to the Office of Financial Management on September 13. The Governor's Budget will be released in mid-December, and the first day of session is January 8, 2024. Mr. Milliern did not anticipate any special sessions this year due to a very packed schedule and election year.

Chair Willhite suggested future conversations around carbon credits, increasing administrative costs, and possible future LPM funding.

Regarding the CFP funding request, **Member Craig** asked if additional funding is requested for other programs. Mr. Milliern replied that the request for additional CFP funding is unique, and as an agency, RCO considers budget capacity before requesting additional funds.

Grants Update

Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Conservation Grants Section Manager, provided a funding update. Ms. Austin emphasized that between the board and director's approval of funds for the 2023-25 biennium, 475 projects were funded for a total of \$201 million, and staff were working hard to issue grant agreements by the end of the month.

Ms. Austin highlighted the LPM program, an office program funded through the operating budget. Director Duffy will make awards in November. There was overwhelming interest in this program with 214 applications, totaling almost \$19 million in requested funds, with only \$5 million available. Of note, several entities that applied for LPM were first time applicants or had not applied in many years. There are two types of projects eligible for LPM funding for deferred maintenance, Tier One: Multisite projects which will primarily be funded in the first year; and Tier Two: Single Site projects, or projects that may have an impact on cultural resources, which will be mostly funded in the second year.

Member Burgess asked what the distribution of applications was across the state. Ms. Austin will provide an update that will include a map of where applications were received from and where they were awarded at a future meeting, after awards have been made.

Chair Willhite asked Ms. Austin to review the outreach done to provide information to potential applicants. Ms. Austin explained that staff used existing contact lists from other grant programs; social media outreach; outreach to entities like the Washington

Port Association, Association of Washington Cities, and Infrastructure Assistance Coordinating Council; and the Washington Recreation and Park Association (WRPA), who played a large role in RCO receiving this funding, provided outreach of their own. Additionally, nearly 400 people registered for an applicant webinar hosted by staff.

Ms. Austin added a final note that at the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officer’s Conference, attended by Director Duffy, it was announced that there would be a Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership grant round in 2024. The National Park Service (NPS) changed the definition of “urban” from 50,000 people to 30,000 people and staff are hopeful that there are projects in the state that sponsors are willing to submit. **Director Duffy** added that the NPS is soliciting feedback on the challenges that applicants face to hopefully increase the number of applicants and awards across the state. Director Duffy highlighted the differences in outdoor recreation between other states and emphasized how well-suited Washington is for LWCF funding.

BREAK: 9:52 – 10:02 AM

General Public Comment

None.

Item 3: Grant Criteria Changes

Chair Willhite noted there will be a special meeting in December to make a decision this agenda item.

Leah Dobey, Policy Specialist, reviewed three key grant criteria changes:

- 1) Objective Measures – to help determine the need for a project.
- 2) Criteria Cleanup – includes changes staff hope to make that are outside the scope of this project but overlap with proposed changes.
- 3) Criteria Weight – the weight of the changes and how that affects the other criteria.

Ms. Dobey reminded the board that this project is in response to recommendations made by the Prevention Institute’s equity review, which noted opportunities for improving programs through modifying scoring criteria to elevate projects addressing park and greenspace inequities, and the [State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan’s](#) (SCORP) unified strategy that included priorities like providing meaningful access to outdoor recreation for all and supporting healthy, adaptable, and connected communities. This project also fits in the board’s [Resolution 2020-35](#), a commitment to

diversity, equity, and inclusion and to continually review policies and practices within agency operations, ensuring that funding is distributed across the state and serving all Washingtonians.

Proposed changes will focus on need, need satisfaction, project support, and expansion and renovation criteria across the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA), Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF), LWCF, WWRP – Local Parks, Water Access, and Trails programs. The draft language for these proposed updates is included in Attachment A of the [materials](#) associated with this meeting.

Ben Donatelle, Policy Specialist, explained that three data-driven measures were used to assess need and connect statewide priorities of SCORP and the equity review: green space availability, social vulnerability, and poor health outcomes. Changing these measures from being scored by an evaluation committee to a staff scored metric will alleviate applicant burden and provide more consistency on how these measures are used to determine need.

Mr. Donatelle described the greenspace availability map which grades census tracts on how much greenspace is available per one thousand people using a ranking of low (less than three acres), medium (three to eight acres), and high (more than eight acres). The Prevention Institute used the United States Geological Survey (USGS) definition of greenspace that essentially includes all public lands, but removed land that is prohibited from public access from their analysis so that only publicly accessible greenspace is used. Currently, both project proposals and funded projects are heavily weighted to areas with high greenspace availability across the six programs under review. The expected outcome of implementing a data-driven project assessment and giving points to projects from low greenspace areas is to see a balance of the proportionality of proposals and funded projects across high, medium, and low greenspace areas.

Member Ohlson-Kiehn asked how greenspace is currently being treated and Mr. Donatelle answered that it is not currently included in the criteria and will be added as part of the final recommendation.

Noting the higher greenspace in Eastern Washington, and how Eastern Washington provides outdoor infrastructure for Western Washington, **Member Windrope** wondered if there are assumptions in adding greenspace that may have unintended consequences. Mr. Donatelle agreed that the greenspace availability measure is weighted towards urban areas, adding that the goal is to close the gap between access to greenspace and where people live.

The social vulnerability measure is provided by the Washington State Department of Health (DOH) per census tract with a ranking of one through ten, one being the lowest. Mr. Donatelle noted that this is a more balanced indicator of the state. This index is made of sixteen measures in four categories: household composition and disability; race, ethnicity, and language; housing type and transportation; and socioeconomic determinants. Across the six programs under review, there is an even distribution of projects proposed and funded coming from each social vulnerability rank; however, by individual program, some programs perform better than others at meeting the needs of communities. By implementing this scored criterion that gives more points to projects from places with higher social vulnerability, staff hope to improve the distribution of funding towards those communities.

Referring to the proposed scoring in the [materials](#), **Member Ohlson-Kiehn** asked why the points distribution skips the vulnerability rating of four. Mr. Donatelle explained that excluding the fourth rating provided a greater lift to the more vulnerable places, but point distribution is still being considered.

The health outcomes measure is also provided by the DOH using a subset of the health disparities map. The measure uses five metrics that primarily targets health outcomes like cancer deaths, deaths from cardiovascular disease, low birthweight, lower life expectancy at birth, and premature death. This measure is also ranked one through ten. The mental and physical health benefits of having access to greenspace dramatically improves these health outcomes and giving points to the areas that rank higher will hopefully improve benefits that greenspace provides to those areas. Again, across the six programs under review, there is an even distribution of projects proposed and funded across each health outcome rank; however, individually, some programs favor areas with lower health outcome rankings.

Member Shiosaki noted that some greenspace access, particularly around water, will likely always be in areas with better health outcomes and provide water access to people that might not otherwise have access to waterfront. Mr. Donatelle agreed and highlighted that together these three criteria are proposed to be around ten percent of the score. **Member Herzog** asked if non-natural water features or access would still be included in these. Mr. Donatelle answered that the SCORP assessment of water access includes water features. **Member Lam** asked whether service area should be included for water access versus project area only. Mr. Donatelle answered that there is direction provided to applicants to include this in the narrative part of the need criteria.

Ms. Dobby noted that throughout the rest of the criteria that are outside of the project scope, there are some redundant prompts included in the suitability, immediacy of

threat, sustainability, cost efficiencies, and readiness to proceed criteria. Some of these will be removed as part of the clean-up work necessary for the proposed changes and can be found in the [materials](#).

Changes will be made to criteria scoring weight. Based on recommendations from the equity review and unified strategy, the need criteria will be about thirty percent of the overall project weight to elevate projects with the greatest need. Similarly, it was recommended to increase the weight of project support. Past board priorities and decisions will also need to be balanced in the weight redistribution. The final scoring rubric needs to be functional and user friendly for evaluators. Ms. Dobby explained the existing and proposed relative value of criteria, which are found in tables beginning on page five of Item 3 of the [materials](#). Of note, the narrative portion of the need criteria be weighted more than the objective portion of the criteria.

Staff will continue outreach through November and return in December for a board decision. If approved, changes will be implemented beginning in January to be used in the spring grant round. Grant Services and outdoor grants managers will be trained in why the changes were made and how, and PRISM staff will make updates to the application process. Externally, the public will be informed of changes through outreach, social media, and hosting webinars, both live and recorded.

Member Shiosaki requested seeing this information in different ways, recommending listing percentage of value for each criterion to tell the story of why each change is a priority. Mr. Donatelle noted the request and mentioned that based on the equity review, SCORP, and community and board feedback, these changes were deemed a priority.

Member Lam suggested looking into the duplications in scoring and presenting that in December. For example, where need carries into the immediacy of threat criteria.

Member Craig asked about conversations with tribes. **Director Duffy** shared that originally a separate email was sent to tribal natural resource directors, and for some the comment period was not long enough. The comment period has been extended and conversations are continuing.

Item 4: Celebrate Chair Ted Willhite

Director Duffy highlighted Chair Ted Willhite's significant contributions to the board. Chair Willhite began serving the board as a member in January 2012 and was appointed Chair in February 2016. Director Duffy shared her personal experience of working with Chair Willhite and looks forward to continued conversations and relationship with him.

Member Shiosaki read the resolution to honor Chair Willhite.

Members of the board took turns sharing their memories and appreciation of working with Chair Willhite over the years. Members described Chair Willhite as a statesman, friend, and leader dedicated to DEI, climate issues, and a dedicated recreationist full of curiosity and exuberance.

Past RCO Director Kaleen Cottingham and Washington Wildlife Recreation Coalition (WWRC) Executive Director Christine Mahler added their appreciation and deep gratitude for Chair Willhite.

Deputy Director Scott Robinson shared a list of funding statistics under Chair Willhite's leadership and time on the board that included 2,000 projects and \$800 million in awarded funds.

Director Duffy read a letter from Governor Inslee honoring Chair Willhite and presented a gift of framed photos from opening ceremonies.

Chair Willhite addressed each board member, sharing a personalized message of thanks for what each individually provides the board. Outside of the board, Chair Willhite shared appreciation for Christine Gregoire who appointed him to the board, Jon Snyder for his continued support, Kaleen Cottingham, Director Megan Duffy, Deputy Director Scott Robinson, Marguerite Austin, Ben Donatelle, Leah Dobey, Brock Milliern, Julia McNamara, Katie Knight-Pruit, Myra Barker, Adam Cole, Rory Calhoun, Anya Boetcher, Kathleen Barkis, and the late Hariett Spanel. Outside of the board and staff, Chair Willhite recognized Christine Mahler, WWRC Chair Hannah Clark and board, and his wife Peggy Willhite.

LUNCH: 12:06 – 1:05 PM

Item 5: Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) Policy Change

Brock Milliern provided a brief overview of the current YAF program, which was re-established in 2015 to enhance facilities that serve youth through the age of eighteen who participate in sports and athletics. Types of projects eligible for YAF funding include development, renovation, and a combination of acquisition and development. The large projects category ranges from \$25,000 to \$350,000, and small projects category provides up to \$75,000 based on community size. Uniquely, YAF has no planning eligibility requirement, is done through a written evaluation only, and nonprofits are eligible as sponsors.

There are four policy proposals for YAF that are outlined in the [materials](#). These changes focus on:

1. Land Acquisition Projects – currently not allowed.
2. Increased Grant Limits – for both the small and large project categories.
3. Sliding Scale Grants.
4. Limit Matching Grants – limitations on matching WWRP – Local Parks.

Mr. Milliern noted that these proposed changes stand-alone except for Increased Grant Limits and Limited Matching Grants. If the board chooses not to increase the grant limits to a certain amount, then staff recommends not making a change to limiting matching grants.

Ben Donatelle shared that collectively these four proposals are meant to help implement the board's unified strategies from the SCORP implementation plan. Specifically, Unified Strategy Two directs staff to review and revise grant program policies to adapt to emerging community needs and challenges. Of particular importance to the strategy are actions:

- 2.1: Reduce barriers to grant funding for under-resourced communities.
- 2.3 Support visitor services that expand pathways to experiencing new opportunities.
- 2.6: Leverage innovative acquisition strategies for outdoor recreation and conservation lands.
- 2.8: Implement recommendations from...the youth physical activity task force report.

A public comment period for these four proposals provided staff with six individual comments, two of which were representative of large recreation coalitions, including WRPA and WWRC. Overall, public comment favored no change for allowing land acquisition, were in favor of increasing grant limits and a sliding scale and were neutral on limiting matching grants.

Mr. Milliern explained the primary objectives behind these changes were to address inflation, outpacing the ability for projects to be completed with grant limits and the over subscription of WWRP – Local Parks. Additionally, part of the equity review suggested different levels of match limits for communities with limited resources.

Mr. Milliern detailed the first policy proposal, which allows for land acquisition only without development in the YAF Large Grants category. The public shared concern for entities purchasing land with the intent of using it for YAF but ending up using it for

something else. Staff still recommend this policy for acquisition only in the large grants category because nonprofits are eligible and there are no planning requirements in YAF, which is different from WWRP – Local Parks, a grant category that allows acquisition-only. RCO has compliance policies in place and the compliance team works to resolve issues should they arise.

The second policy addresses grant limits no longer meeting the need for developing projects. Staff recommend increasing grant limits in the YAF Large category to \$1.5 million and YAF Small category to \$350,000.

Mr. Donatelle explained the proposed sliding scale grant limit policy. The concept is to increase grant limits as a sponsor's or applicant's match obligation decreases. Table Two in the [materials](#) shows the proposed sliding scale compared to no sliding scale. The public slightly favored adopting a sliding scale; this along with an equity review's recommendation and the opportunity to pilot a sliding scale in a stand-alone program led staff to recommend adopting sliding scale grants in the YAF Large Grants category.

Member Ohlson-Kiehn asked for those commenters who did not support this approach, why not? Mr. Donatelle answered that a few public commenters felt that everyone should have the same opportunity for the same amount of the grant, and communities should be able to right-size projects based on what is financially available to them.

Member Burgess questioned the grant limits shown in the sliding scale, noting for communities that require just ten percent match the grant limit is \$2.7 million, compared to the \$1.5 million recommended as the proposed grant limit. Mr. Milliern clarified that the \$1.5 million is used as the base program for communities that are eligible for match reduction. **Member Shiosaki** suggested using language like "up to \$2.7 million" since the sliding scale does change the grant limit.

Members discussed maximum grant limits, capacity, and how funding may go further in some parts of the state than in others. Mr. Milliern noted that the differences between communities across the state make it difficult to directly compare one to the other. Mr. Donatelle added that the hope with the sliding scale is to provide more equal opportunity across the state. Members continued to discuss the sliding scale and the potential impact.

Mr. Donatelle explained the final proposed policy that would limit the opportunity for sponsors to match YAF to WWRP – Local Parks for the same grant element, same project year, and same facilities. Staff recommend approving limiting matching YAF and

WWRP – Local Parks if the grant limits were raised to \$1.5 million as proposed in the second policy to maintain equal funding opportunity.

Members discussed these four policy changes, expressing concern around the third, implementing sliding scale grant limits. The main concerns with this policy were potential unintended consequences and the maximum grant limit of \$2.7 million being much higher than the proposed \$1.5 million.

Member Windrope motioned to approve land acquisition as an eligible project type, approve increasing the grant limit, not approve sliding scale, and was silent on limiting match.

Member Ohlson-Kiehn asked whether this motion would help solve the goal of shifting applicants from WWRP – Local parks to YAF. Mr. Donatelle answered that increasing the grant limits should help solve the oversubscription to WWRP – Local Parks.

Member Shiosaki moved to amend **Member Windrope's** motion to include the prohibition on match. Member Windrope accepted this amendment, and **Member Herzog** seconded the amended motion. Member Shiosaki justified his motion, explaining that unless the prohibition of match was accepted then the goal of the other changes would not be accomplished.

Before a final vote, **Chair Willhite** clarified the amended motion by **Member Shiosaki** with the following summary: *acquisition only is approved, increase in the maximum grant is approved, the sliding scale is not approved, and the prohibition against the match is approved.*

Motion: Move to Approve Resolution 2023-26

Moved By: Member **Windrope**

Seconded by: Member **Burgess**

Amended by: Member **Shiosaki**

Amendment seconded by: Member **Herzog**

Decision: **Approved as amended**

Member Windrope expressed interest in continuing the conversation on the sliding scale policy in the future, and **Director Duffy** suggested having that conversation after a grant round if the criteria changes are approved in December.

Public Comment

None.

Item 6: Equity Grant Program

Brock Milliern presented the concept of developing an Equity Grant Program, which was a recommendation of the Prevention Institute's equity review and would specifically support communities with fewer resources. Staff would work on this concept over the 2024 calendar year, with a potential goal of requesting funding for this program in the 2025-27 biennium. Future conversations would include consideration of applicant and project eligibility, program objectives, program timing, funding, and whether there should be a connection to Planning for Recreation Access (PRA).

Chair Willhite asked if there were plans to take this program to the Legislature, and Mr. Milliern answered only for a funding request.

Member Burgess would like more information on what the funding source would be, and if there is anything like this program that already exists in any other state.

Member Burgess left the meeting at 2:10 p.m.

Item 7: State Agency Partner Reports

Department of Natural Resources

Member Kristen Ohlson-Kiehn provided an update of the Outdoor Access and Responsible Recreation (OARR) strategic plan planning process that launched in January. Following feedback from tribes, DNR initiated an engagement strategy consisting of four Tribal forums located in eastern Washington, the coast, and upper and lower Puget Sound. The final and fourth forum was completed on October 24. DNR has asked participating tribes to co-author the purpose statement and goals of the strategic plan. DNR will engage in outreach with stakeholders to develop strategies and actions.

In August, DNR hosted a [Board of Natural Resources \(BNR\)](#) retreat focused on the DNR Recreation Program and included a tour in Whatcom County. Along with BNR board members, the tour was attended by Skagit County Commissioner Ron Wesen, Whatcom County Councilmember Kaylee Galloway, and Senator Sharon Shewmake.

Funding from the 2023 Legislative session has allowed DNR to recruit for an Environmental Planning 4 and Natural Scientist 2. Additionally, DNR is beginning to scope the second phase of the Cell Phone Data Revisitation Project that includes Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Earth Economics and uses cell phone data to track visitation on state lands. DNR's updated Trust Land Transfer program was open for applications from September 1-30 and received thirty-three applications from state

agencies, cities, counties, and tribes, including nine applications from DNR's Natural Areas program.

The Conservation Acquisitions program, with support from WWRP, completed key transactions including the acquisition of a property in the Dabob Bay Natural Area. This program also administers United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Section Six, threatened and endangered species land acquisition grants on behalf of Washington State and is currently sponsoring four projects totaling more than \$23 million. In September USFWS announced an award of \$6.6 million for the White Salmon Watershed Phase Two project that will permanently protect 1,410 acres.

DNR administers United States Forest Service (USFS) Forest Legacy program for Washington State, which received five applications for fiscal year 2025, of which DNR submitted the top two, totaling \$19 million. A second grant round was created using Inflation Reduction Act funding, and DNR received three applications that they will decide which to forward to the national round.

State Parks and Recreation Commission

Member Peter Herzog shared that State Parks was able to acquire the Bear Creek Lodge property at the entrance to Mount Spokane state park. This acquisition includes a lodge and other facilities and used funds from WWRP and the sale of a property in downtown Auburn.

State Parks is involved in the interagency tribal effort on looking at recreation impacts statewide that Member Ohlson-Kiehn mentioned and received funding from Legislature for this work. WDFW, DNR, and State Parks are working with the Governor's Office of Indian Affairs (GOIA) and have formed a joint state-tribal steering committee to assess and improve management of recreation impacts on ecological values and tribal protected rights. The steering committee has met six times and discussions are progressing.

Member Herzog highlighted the new State Parks website that went live on October 24. The changes were geared toward parks and park users and incorporated accessibility improvements for a better web experience.

Upcoming proposals Legislative session included additional funds for development of Nisqually State Park that previously received \$24 million. State Parks is requesting an additional \$2.3 million from supplemental for a roundabout that will need to be built as a regulatory requirement. Additionally, State Parks is requesting funding for a second Tribal Liaison position to assist the agency's Director of Tribal Affairs.

Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

Member Amy Windrope shared that WDFW is also a part of the interagency tribal effort which was invited to submit a proposal to the America the Beautiful Challenge for funding and should hear back on whether they were successful in November.

WDFW put in a request for Legislation, similar to what DNR has, which will allow nonprofit organizations, volunteers, and volunteer organizations to help maintain WDFW managed land.

A contract was provided to the Washington Trails Association (WTA) for WTA to be ambassadors at six sites. The contract is currently under review.

WDFW is conducting a trail inventory and is considering a review of rulemaking and law enforcement on WDFW managed lands.

Governor's Office

Jon Snyder, Governor's Office, shared that the upcoming Centennial Accord, between the Governor's Office and Washington State's sovereign Tribal Nations, will have managing recreational impacts on public lands as part of the agenda.

The Governor's Office has been assisting in working on the stay of litigation for the Lower Snake River Dams.

Governor Inslee was on an outreach tour around the state, emphasizing the Climate Commitment Act (CCA), and the importance of taking bold action on climate change and sharing the great projects being funded by the CCA.

On a final note, Mr. Snyder recognized Chair Willhite's incredible impact on the board and shared the Governor's support of him.

ADJOURN: 2:38 PM

A special meeting will be held on December 4 to decide on the Grant Criteria Changes.

The next regular meeting is scheduled for January 30 and 31 at the Natural Resources Building, 1111 Washington Street SE, Olympia, WA 98501.



Chair Michael Shiosaki