

## State Lands Development and Renovation Category

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

### Summary of Criteria

Criteria	Maximum Points	Focus*
<b>Scored by Advisory Committee</b>		
1 Public Need	20 points	State Focus
2 Site Suitability and Design	15 points	Technical Focus
3 Sustainability	5 points	State Focus
4 Diversity and Compatibility	10 points	State Focus
5 Performance Measure	5 points	State Focus
6 Public Benefit and Project Support	5 points	State Focus
<b>Score by RCO</b>		
7 Population Proximity	1 point	State Focus
<b>Total Points Possible: 61 points</b>		

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

- State—Those that meet general statewide needs (often called for in Revised Codes of Washington or the *State Recreation and Conservation Plan*)
- Local—Those that meet local needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans)
- Technical—Those that meet technical considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

## Detailed Evaluation Criteria

- 1. Public Need.** Considering the availability and use of existing facilities within the service area, what is the need for new or improved facilities?<sup>87</sup>

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

- Existing capacity: Are nearby sites used to capacity?
- Are there unserved or under-served user groups?
- Is there a threat to the public availability of the resources the site possesses?
- What are the demonstrated needs for development or renovation?
- Long-term manageability: How does the improvement or renovation contribute to ongoing management and maintenance of the facilities?
- How well will this project satisfy the needs identified?
- What is the expected or potential use upon completion of this project?
- Describe existing conditions and explain how this project will improve the visitor experience.
- Describe the project's statewide or regional significance.
- Consider whether the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan.

▲ Point Range: zero to five points, which are multiplied later by four

Revised January 2008, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Resolution 2008-09

- 2. Site Suitability and Project Design.** Does the project demonstrate good design criteria? Does it make the best use of the site?

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

---

<sup>87</sup>Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007, Chapter 5

- Will site resources be made available appropriately for public use or recreation?
- Will natural, environmental, or other important values be protected by the proposed development?
- How well does the project satisfy the identified needs?

Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. Some design elements that may be considered include the following:

- Accuracy of cost estimates
- Aesthetics
- Complexity of permitting
- Environmentally friendly design
- Innovation and sustainability
- Maintenance
- Materials
- Phasing
- Recreation experiences
- Readiness to proceed
- Risk management
- Site suitability
- Space relationships
- Suitability of the proposed improvements
- User friendly and universally accessible

▲ Point Range: zero to five points, which are multiplied later by three

Revised January 2008, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Resolution 2008-09

**3. Sustainability.** Sustainability reflects choices made to balance the desired benefits and potential impacts of a project on the surrounding landscape and community. Please discuss how the project's location or design supports the applicant's organization's sustainability plan or how the ecological, economic, and social benefits and impacts were considered in the project plan.

Examples of sustainability factors that could be part of a project or maintenance plan are provided below for consideration but are not all-inclusive. Applicants and evaluators should treat this list as a guide, not a checklist. Applicants are encouraged to be creative in expressing the sustainability factors of their projects, and evaluators should score projects based on the extent to which applicants have considered and addressed the benefits and impacts of their projects whether they discuss one of the factors below or many.

*Ecological Factors*

- Minimizes impacts to, or improves ecological function of, surrounding lands
- Includes low-impact design or other green building techniques that reduce water, energy, resource consumption, or greenhouse gas footprint
- Provides a buffer to future natural disasters or anticipated climate impacts
- Includes landscaping that supports native species and/or pollinator habitat

*Social Factors*

- Addresses an identified disparity in social or environmental services
- Encourages access via multi-modal and active transportation choices
- Promotes opportunities for physical activity, social and cultural connections, or community education

*Economic Factors*

- Uses materials that support local producers, are recycled or recyclable, increase the project's anticipated lifespan, or reduce future maintenance costs
- Creates efficiency in the provision of public services (i.e., stormwater infiltration, increased tree canopy, carbon sequestration, etc.)
- Maximizes lifespan or reduces future operational costs
- Supports a local economic development initiative

▲ Point Range: zero to five points

Adopted January 2020, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Resolution 2020-06

**4. Diversity of and Compatibility of Recreational Uses.** To what extent does this project provide diversity of possible recreational uses?<sup>88</sup>

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

▲ Point Range: zero to five points, which are multiplied later by two

**5. Outcome-Focused Performance Measures.** To what extent does the project result in measurable progress toward goals and objectives for the recreation or access area?

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

Outline the proposed project schedule, timelines, and who will perform the work. Describe how the project will impact the habitat, fish and wildlife resources, and provide public benefits.

▲ Point Range: zero to five points

Revised January 2008, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Resolution 2008-09

**6. Public Benefit and Project Support.** To what extent does this project result in measurable benefits for the community impacted as a result of this development or renovation?

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

Broadly interpret the term "Project Support" to consider the following:

- Explain the extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e., an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.

---

<sup>88</sup>Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007, Chapters 1 and 5

- To what degree do communities, governments, landowners, constituent groups, or academia benefit from, or support, the project?
- How have these groups been involved in project development?
- Is there known opposition? Explain.
- Describe and document any monetary means that have been secured to help with implementation of the project (i.e., endowments, grants, donations, public/private management agreements, etc.)
- Identify endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user or friends groups.
- Describe the support or partnerships with the community, interest groups, volunteers, public agencies, etc.

▲ Point Range: zero to five points

Adopted February 2006, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Resolution 2006-04

**7. Population Proximity** (applicant does not answer). Is the project in a populated area?<sup>89</sup>

The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board's policy is to give funding preference to projects located in populated areas. Populated areas are defined (Revised Code of Washington 79A.25.250) as a town or city with a population of 5,000 or more, or a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile. Is the project in an area meeting this definition?

▲ Point Range: RCO staff award a maximum of one point.

Adopted February 2006, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Resolution 2006-04

---

<sup>89</sup>Revised Code of Washington 79A.25.250