

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD
SUMMARIZED MEETING AGENDA & ACTIONS
October 29-30, 2014

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up
1. Consent Calendar A. Approve Board Meeting Minutes – July 16-17, 2014 B. Approve Board Meeting Minutes -August 26, 2014 C. Approve Board Meeting Dates and Locations for 2015 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 8-9 (Olympia) • June 24-25 (Olympia) • September 16-17 (Travel meeting, location TBD) • November 18-19 (Olympia) D. Approve Time Extensions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 08-1175 Acquisition: Bone and Niawiakum River Natural Area Preserves • 08-1177 Acquisition: Cypress Island Natural Area 2008 • 07-1974 Acquisition and Development: Malaga Community Park 	APPROVED Resolution 2014-18	No follow up action requested.
2. Overview of Agenda and 50 th Anniversary Celebration		No follow up action requested.
3. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Framework		The board requested information regarding overall funding amounts in each WWRP category since 1991, demonstrating how the funding and/or projects translate to jobs and economic impacts. RCO staff will review the available information to determine if this is feasible based on the existing data collected.

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up
4. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Outdoor Recreation Account Grants		Staff will forward the lists to the Governor for consideration in his capital budget.
A. Local Parks Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-19	For the "Trails" category, the board request further information and a future discussion on the Supreme Court decision and policy implications of grant investments made on railroad ROWs.
B. State Lands Development and Renovation Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-20	
C. State Parks Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-21	
D. Trails Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-22	
E. Water Access Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-23	
5. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Riparian	APPROVED Resolution 2014-24	Staff will forward the list to the Governor for consideration in his capital budget.
6. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Farmland Preservation Account Grants	APPROVED Resolution 2014-25	Staff will forward the list to the Governor for consideration in his capital budget.
7. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Habitat Conservation Account Grants		Staff will forward the list to the Governor for consideration in his capital budget.
A. Critical Habitat Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-26	
B. Natural Areas Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-27	
C. State Lands Restoration Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-28	
D. Urban Wildlife Habitat Category	APPROVED Resolution 2014-29	
8. Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Grants	APPROVED Resolution 2014-30	Staff will forward the list to the Governor for consideration in his capital budget.
9. Director's Report		No follow up action requested.
A. Director's Report		
B. Policy Report and Legislative Preparations		
C. Grant Management Report		
D. Performance Report		
E. Fiscal Report		
10. State Agency Partner Reports		No follow up action requested.

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up
11. Feedback on the Grant Evaluation Process		See Item 15. Also, staff will follow up with applicants to provide information about the actions taken at this meeting regarding the ranked lists of projects.
12. Youth and Community Athletic Facilities Program		The board requested that staff explore options for waiving match requirements, and to define what the phrase "open to the public" means, and report back at the April 2015 meeting.
13. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Phase II Public Hearing	APPROVED Resolution 2014-31	Staff will file the final rule-making and updated RCO's public records and disclosure webpage to include the new information and cost/fee schedule.
14. Conversion Request: City of Bellevue, Mercer Slough	DEFERRED Resolution 2014-32	The board requested additional information and deferred the decision to approve/deny the conversion request to the April 2015 board meeting.
15. Board Survey and Strategic Plan		The board requested that a retreat be scheduled next year, during which they would like to address in detail the board strategic plan and applicable performance measures, using data from the board survey, the performance report, and feedback from the grant evaluation process (Item 11). The board formed a subcommittee and requested that facilitator be present, if possible, to lead the retreat.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD MEETING SUMMARY

Date: October 29, 2014

Place: Olympia, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Harriet Spanel	Chair, Bellingham	Jed Herman	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Betsy Bloomfield	Yakima	Don Hoch	Director, Washington State Parks
Mike Deller	Mukilteo	Joe Stohr	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pete Mayer	Renton		
Ted Willhite	Twisp		

It is intended that this summary 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 Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) meeting.

**Due to technical difficulties, the recording did not begin until the end of Item 4A, 54 minutes into the meeting.*

Opening and Call to Order

Chair Spanel called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. Staff called roll, and a quorum was determined. The agenda was reviewed and approved by the board.

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Pete Mayer

Agenda: APPROVED

Director Cottingham explained the contents of the board members' folders as they pertained to the meeting over the next two days.

Item 1: Consent Calendar

The board reviewed Resolution 2014-18, Consent Calendar. This resolution included:

- A. Approval of the July 17-18, 2014 board meeting minutes
- B. Approval of the August 26, 2014 board meeting minutes
- C. Approval of the board meeting dates and locations for 2015
 - April 8-9 (Olympia)
 - June 24-25 (Olympia)
 - September 16-17 (Travel meeting, location TBD)
 - November 18-19 (Olympia)
- D. Approval of Time Extensions:
 - 08-1175 Acquisition: Bone and Niawiakum River Natural Area Preserves
 - 08-1177 Acquisition: Cypress Island Natural Area 2008

- 07-1974 Acquisition and Development: Malaga Community Park

Resolution 2014-18

Moved by: Member Pete Mayer

Seconded by: Member Ted Willhite

Resolution: APPROVED

General Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Item 2: Overview of Agenda and 50th Anniversary Celebration

Director Cottingham distributed vests to the board members in honor of RCO's 50th Anniversary Celebration. Scott Robinson, Deputy Director provided an overview of the agenda and logistics for both days of the meeting, including the celebration event at the State Capitol building.

Item 3: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Framework

Scott Robinson shared information about the formation of the WWRP program, including background and purpose. He described the structure and current statistics of the program, and also provided an outline of program funding allocation for each account and their respective categories. The current calculation WWRP program budget is allocated based on statute, and examples of the breakdown to each category were presented based on potential funding amounts.

The board requested information regarding overall funding amounts in each WWRP category since 1991, and whether there was a matrix that demonstrates how the funding and/or projects translate to jobs and economic impacts, i.e., when a grant is awarded it is often stated that it will create "X" amount of jobs and have "X" impact on the economy. RCO staff will review the available information to determine if this is feasible based on the existing data collected.

Mr. Robinson provided an overview of the 2014 grant cycle, outlining the steps from early fall 2012 to date that are included in the full application, evaluation, and ranking process. He noted that staff would present the projects and ranked lists. The grant process is intended to fund priority projects that meet local and state needs, and an overview of the policies behind phased projects was presented. A brief description of the applications received to date in each account over the past five biennia demonstrated the trends that show fluctuations in each respective category.

Member Mayer requested a visual representation of the historical and current number of applications received, the respective funding requests (dollar amounts) for each application, and total funding requests (dollar amounts) per category. Some of this information – the funds requested – is included as part of the board materials, located in their folders.

During the staff presentations today, the board will be asked to approve the lists without funding lines, meaning lists of projects in ranked order without any funding allocations specified. Public comment is provided after each category, and then the board will vote on a resolution for each category. The lists are then submitted to the governor for inclusion in the budget; the governor or legislature can remove projects from the ranked lists, but cannot add projects to the lists. In June 2015, the board will make final approval and funding decisions, after which RCO will initiate contracts for each project.

Item 4: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Outdoor Recreation Account Grants

Darrell Jennings, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager, provided an overview of the Outdoor Recreation Account, and the distribution of applications received as compared to the other three WWRP accounts. Mr. Jennings described the criteria for applicant eligibility, project types, and phased project policies. There were some changes from the 2014 grant cycle highlighted, such as new evaluation criteria and updates to Manual 4. Best practices from the 2012 grant cycle were carried forward.

Item 4A: Local Parks Category

Adam Cole, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about the Local Parks category, including background and purpose. The category is typically the most competitive across the state, with the majority of projects focused on renovation of existing sites. Mr. Cole outlined the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round.

**The meeting recording begins here.*

Mr. Cole highlighted unique projects as part of the 2014 grant round that focus on making parks and playgrounds more accessible to children with disabilities including Selah Volunteer Park and Spokane Mission Park. He concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, Saddle Rock Gateway and Outdoor Education Area, located in Wenatchee (RCO Project [14-1135](#)).

Member Mayer noted that there has been a significant increase in the interest and participation in this category. Member Deller expressed appreciation of the top project, as the public need and use will be worth the funding invested. Member Bloomfield commented that the board should focus on sustainable building practices to enhance the investments made, extending the life of the sites and the value of the funds awarded.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-19

Moved by: Member Pete Mayer

Seconded by: Member Mike Deller

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 4B: State Lands Development Category

Dan Haws, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about the State Lands Development and Renovation category, including background and purpose. He described the criteria for applicant eligibility, project types, and the written evaluation process adopted by the board. An outline was provided that described the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. He noted the funds requested, locations, and the key themes in the projects such as trails, shoreline access, and camping.

He concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, East Tiger Mountain Trail system Development Final Phase, located in King County (RCO Project [11-1034](#)). The trail system is one of the most highly accessed areas in the state, due in part to its proximity to a densely populated urban area.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-20

Moved by: Member Mike Deller

Seconded by: Member Don Hoch

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 4C: State Parks Category

Karl Jacobs, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about the State Parks category, including background and purpose. A unique element of this category is that renovation projects are not eligible in this category, and only new development projects are considered. Mr. Jacobs highlighted some of the new policies for this category, specifically regarding the evaluation process. He outlined the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round.

Mr. Jacobs concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, Inholdings and Adjacent Properties 2014 (RCO Project [14-1681](#)). Briefings of several proposed projects were shared, including photos and high-level project details.

Member Spanel commented on the Clayton Beach funding, specifically with regard to the long-term funding delays and challenges. The board discussed the details of the projects highlighted, for further clarification and information purposes.

Public Comment

Peter Herzog, Assistant Director of Washington State Parks, provided comments in support of the process and results presented to the board. He was appreciative of the preparations made by RCO staff to bring the information to the board. He provided some background on the concerns of the evaluation process and criteria for the category, highlighting two key changes. First, he shared that the centennial strategic plan for State Parks and the phased projects emphasis where points are added in this category, were typically where the disconnect between the State Parks Commission and the evaluation committee have occurred. The changes to the criteria are intended to bring alignment between these groups. He noted that it's good that 50% of the evaluators/advisory committee members are non-state parks staff, and supports the diversity of the process. The second change he discussed was that the State Parks Commission does not approve lists, but will score one evaluation question that addresses how well the project supports the mission and vision of State Parks. Also, the commission will not have the ability to change the ranking but may withdraw projects. State Parks committed to working on fine-tuning the evaluation and ranking process, identifying determining factors that would bring more clarity to the Commission's evaluations. Mr. Herzog described the new process to coordinate with tribes, fulfilling State Parks' obligations towards management requirements.

Resolution 2014-21

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Betsy Bloomfield

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 4D: Trails Category

Darrell Jennings, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about the Trails category, including background and purpose. This category supports the most popular form of recreation according to the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan – walking and hiking. He described the criteria for applicant eligibility, project types, and evaluation of projects. Three unique criteria include 1) trail and community linkages, 2) water access, views and scenic values, and 3) wildlife habitat connectivity. He outlined the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. He noted the funds requested, locations, and how the projects collectively meet the criteria for the category.

Mr. Jennings concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, Spruce Railroad McFee Tunnel Restoration, located in Clallam County as part of the Olympic Discovery Trail (RCO Project [14-1124](#)). He shared the rich history of the project, the current status, and future plans for the site. Clallam County addressed the board's new Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship criteria by sharing how this project is benefitting from another public works project, the removal of the Elwha River Dam, and how the recycled concrete from the dams will become the base-layers for the new trail. He highlighted for the board two cross-state trail visions, and how projects submitted as applications this grant cycle in multiple grant programs and categories, such as Trails and State Parks categories of WWRP, and the Recreational Trails Program projects, are helping to complete these cross-state trails.

Member Willhite commented that the Supreme Court recently made a decision concerning "rails to trails" and the potential of reversionary rights for these corridors. Marguerite Austin responded with the most current information available, stating that we currently believe the trails that RCO has funded so far will not be impacted by the court decision but we are not certain. There may be policy ramifications associated with those trails, which may be brought to the board at a later time in order to balance legal requirements, board direction, and public use. Member Mayer commented on the complexity of the policy implications, and encouraged a deeper understanding of the potential impacts of the legislation and discussion among the board.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-22

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Don Hoch

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 4E: Water Access Category

Laura Moxham, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about the Water Access category, including background and purpose. Marine access and water access to rivers, lakes, and streams are the focus of this category. A unique element is that 75% of the allocated funds must go towards acquiring land. An outline was provided that described the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. She explained that projects include habitat enhancement, fishing, general access, restrooms, and signage. The demonstration of diverse use is highly scored in this category, and many support restoration and amenity development.

Ms. Moxham concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, the Washougal Waterfront Water Access Area, located on the Columbia River in Clark County (RCO Project [14-1347](#)).

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-23

Moved by: Member Pete Mayer

Seconded by: Member Betsy Bloomfield

Resolution: APPROVED

Break 10:55 a.m. – 11:10 a.m.

Item 5: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Riparian Protection Account Grants

Sarah Thirtyacre, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager, provided an overview of the Riparian Protection Account, in which there is only one category of the same name. She shared a graphic to demonstrate the distribution of applications received as compared to the other three WWRP accounts. She described the criteria for applicant eligibility, project types, and evaluation elements.

Applications from this grant round were highlighted, including the geographic spread of the projects across the state. The unique and varied habitat included in this round's applications were described through photos and high-level project details. Habitat threats are a focus in this category, balancing mitigation of potential threats and public use.

Ms. Thirtyacre presented the #1 ranked project in the category, Phase 4 of the Mashel Shoreline Protection, located in Pierce County (RCO Project [14-1480](#)).

Ms. Thirtyacre shared that the resolution for this action was revised prior to the meeting because there are not enough projects should the legislature fund WWRP at \$97 million. She described the background and history of the past issues with projects and funding in this account, and provided the rationale for the updated language in the resolution. The revision would allow the agency to select alternate riparian projects on the previously approved WWRP list. Director Cottingham clarified the need for this language, as a potential tool that will ensure that eligible and viable alternate projects are funded should a surplus occur.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-24

Moved by: Member Betsy Bloomfield

Seconded by: Member Mike Deller

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 6: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Farmland Preservation Account Grants

Kim Sellers, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented an overview of the Farmland Preservation Account, including background and purpose. This category is one of the few for which non-profit organizations are eligible to apply, and public agencies are not required to submit matching funds. Using the 2012 Agricultural Census, Ms. Sellers shared information regarding the status and history of Washington farmland acres, with trends showing an overall decrease. However, the estimated value per acre is trending up. Progress in this grant round since 2012 shows increases in the number of applications received (mainly from Skagit County), in the acres proposed for protection, and in the number of easements proposed – three records broken since 2010.

Ms. Sellers shared information about the breakout of the applications received across the state, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. She explained the unique features of the farms, how they support the communities and wildlife, and the variety of different farms and rangelands. She concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, Vander Voet Farm Acquisition, located on Whidbey Island (RCO Project [14-1510](#)).

Member Mayer requested information about how farmland acreage in Washington compares to the national average, and Ms. Sellers committed to obtaining the information and sharing it with the board during tomorrow's meeting. He continued to ask whether there is pressure to change the allocation

formula in statute, considering the recent successes in the program. Director Cottingham affirmed this, stating that the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition has expressed interest in this issue as well.

Member Mayer commented on the correspondence received from Okanogan County regarding projects, asking whether there were other communications regarding further issues. Director Cottingham replied that during the last biennium the Legislature put in a proviso for critical habitat, and after discussions with the county commissioners and after the Legislature didn't pass the capital budget, the project was pulled from the list by WDFW. Member Stohr confirmed concerns regarding the recent economic studies conducted by both Okanogan County and WDFW. There are some conflicts, and both parties are working towards a solution. At this time, WDFW has completed their own economic study and Okanogan County is still in the process of completing their study.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-25

Moved by: Member Mike Deller

Seconded by: Member Ted Willhite

Resolution: APPROVED

Lunch 11:44 a.m. – 12:32 p.m.

Item 7: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Habitat Conservation Account Grants

Sarah Thirtyacre, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager, presented an overview of the Habitat Conservation Account, including the categories and primary focus, eligible project types, the types of habitat protected, applicant eligibility, and important evaluation elements. She noted the process and policy changes for the 2014 evaluations, demonstrating the grant cycle statistics and trends by comparing the current and most recent grant rounds from 2010 and 2012. The main differences included the changes in the written review and evaluation processes between the 2012 and 2014 grant rounds.

Member Mayer inquired about potential reasons why the interest and application numbers in the urban wildlife habitat category are relatively low. The criteria for this category are rather limited, and may contribute to the low response. Another suggestion included advertising more broadly that competition between state agencies is not a factor, as funding is allocated separately. Marguerite Austin shared an example from the City of Seattle, demonstrating that communication, outreach, and education would benefit applicants and inform them of additional options.

Item 7A: Critical Habitat Category

Sarah Thirtyacre, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about Critical Habitat category, including background and purpose. The main focus of this category is protection and management of critical habitat areas for sensitive, threatened, and endangered species; however, the category allows for areas designated for public use. An outline was provided that described the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. Applicants were asked to identify fish and wildlife species on proposed project sites, and describe why these areas are ecologically and biologically unique. Photos were shared that demonstrate the unique and varied habitat of the proposed project sites across the state.

Ms. Thirtyacre shared information about the Grand Coulee Ranch, which has received considerable attention by developers due to its rich and unique characteristics. These desirable features make it difficult

to protect and conserve remaining habitat, particularly the last existing areas of shrub-step. With WWRP funds, the project sponsors intend to protect the habitat into the future.

Ms. Thirtyacre concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, the Mountain View acquisition, located in Asotin County (RCO Project [14-1085](#)). Notably, this project was ranked only one quarter of a point above the next ranked project.

Member Willhite asked whether there is coordination between projects from the Critical Habitat and Trails categories, since trails often cross through critical habitat and in some cases this is allowed. Director Cottingham responded that these issues are dealt with on a case-by-case basis per project, as coordination is voluntary and not a requirement. The overlap could lend synergy to both grant categories, although in projects that propose acquiring easements this can cause issues, e.g., conflicts with public access requirements.

Member Willhite inquired about the authority and criteria for determining critical habitat. Ms. Thirtyacre explained that this is usually defined by applicant and demonstrated through the supporting required plans (which is often WDFW). Member Stohr shared that WDFW has a defined process in place to identify attributes that may qualify, involving "eyeballing" a parcel and then determining which grant category to pursue.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-26

Moved by: Member Don Hoch

Seconded by: Member Ted Willhite

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 7B: Natural Area Category

Kim Sellers, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about the Natural Areas category, including background and purpose. An outline was provided that described the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. Geographically, projects were predominantly located on the western half of the state. Ms. Sellers shared details about the second highest ranked project, Kennedy Creek, noting the recent influx of chum present.

Ms. Sellers concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, Dabob Bay Natural Area Shoreline, located in Jefferson County (RCO Project [14-1249](#)). The U.S. Navy is providing significant funding and land acquisitions to support the project, supplementing the potential award from the board.

The board discussed the main differences between the natural areas category (open to state agencies only; driven by vegetation) and critical habitat (property that needs to be restored in some manner; driven by wildlife and habitat).

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-27

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Mike Deller

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 7C: State Lands Restoration Category

Prior to her presentation, Laura Moxham, Outdoor Grants Manager, clarified the motorized boat access requirements for the ALEA program versus the requirements for the WWRP Water Access category as a follow up to her presentation for Item 4A – WWRP Water Access Category.

Ms. Moxham then presented information about the State Lands Restoration category, including background and purpose. An outline was provided that described the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. Several of the projects focused on prescriptive burning and invasive species removal. She explained what restoration thinning is intended to achieve, and highlighted the types of projects that constitute restoration.

Ms. Moxham concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Grassland Restoration in South Puget Sound, located in Thurston County (RCO Project [14-1697](#)).

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-28

Moved by: Member Betsy Bloomfield

Seconded by: Member Ted Willhite

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 7D: Urban Wildlife Category

Sarah Thirtyacre, Senior Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about Urban Wildlife Category, including purpose and background, as well as criteria for applicant eligibility and project types. An outline was provided that described the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round. Ms. Thirtyacre provided high-level details on several proposed projects, highlighting types of habitat protected, public use and access, and rare species protected.

Ms. Thirtyacre concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, West Rocky Prairie, located south Thurston County (RCO Project [14-1098](#)). Member Deller commended staff for the coordination efforts between land owners, non-profits organization, and state agencies.

Member Mayer clarified the eligibility criteria, and asked about the balance between acquisition and restoration projects. Marguerite Austin explained that although restoration is permissible, they rarely score well; therefore, acquisition projects are more common in this category. Once the State Lands Restoration category was established, this became more popular for those types of sponsors. She helped to clarify the structure of restoration projects and how various organizations handle these types of projects according to their respective partnerships, strategic plans, and funding sources. Member Bloomfield suggested that the categories open to non-profits be highlighted for the WWRC.

Member Willhite asked how our agency, among other state agencies, coordinate with U.S. Forest Service on prescribed burn plans. Ms. Austin explained that it is a coordinated effort based on strategic plans and future restoration plans, often resulting in the largest number of time extension requests due to timing and seasonal sensitivity.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-29

Moved by: Member Pete Mayer

Seconded by: Member Betsy Bloomfield

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 8: Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Grants

Kyle Guzlas, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented information about Aquatic Lands Enhancement account, including background and purpose. The grant program encompasses tidelands, shorelands, harbor areas, and the beds of navigable waters. He provided an overview of the program goals, evaluation criteria, and types of projects in the category. Application criteria for this category stipulates that projects must be adjacent to a navigable water body. Additionally, projects must meet public access goals or restoration/protection goals or both; the criteria are established to meet both sets of goals. An outline was provided that described the breakout of the applications received, applicants, and projects evaluated and ranked as part of the current grant round.

Mr. Guzlas concluded by presenting the #1 ranked project in the category, Glendale Shoreline Access and Restoration, located in Island County (RCO Project [14-1531](#)).

Member Deller asked about Edmonds Pier, an example of using WWRP and ALEA funds. The match came from the respective accounts, which is eligible. Marguerite Austin provided background on the project and the funding process the sponsors went through, meeting the required criteria, to submit their application.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2014-30

Moved by: Member Mayer

Seconded by: Member Willhite

Resolution: APPROVED

Closing Remarks

Director Cottingham acknowledged the RCO staff and Recreation and Conservation Section grant managers that worked to put together today's presentations.

Adjournment

At 2:00 p.m., Chair Spanel adjourned the meeting for the day. The board proceeded to the State Capitol Reception Room for RCO's 50th Anniversary Celebration from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. during which no board business was conducted.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD MEETING SUMMARY

Date: October 30, 2014

Place: Olympia, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members Present:

Harriet Spanel	Chair, Bellingham	Jed Herman	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Betsy Bloomfield	Yakima	Peter Herzog	Designee, Washington State Parks
Mike Deller	Mukilteo	Joe Stohr	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Pete Mayer	Renton		
Ted Willhite	Twisp		

It is intended that this summary 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 Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) meeting.

Call to Order

Chair Spanel called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. Staff called roll, and a quorum was determined.

Management and Partner Reports

Item 9: Director's Report

Director's Report: Director Cottingham provided an update on the recently submitted report drafted by the Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Parks and Outdoor Recreation (task force). The task force was established by executive order, and followed an in-depth public engagement process to reach their final outcomes and recommendations. An outline of the priority action areas and priority near-term actions demonstrated the intended programmatic and funding goals. She described the funding proposal submitted by the task force, as well as several ideas for future implementation of the goals described in the report. Suggestions included proposals such as supporting small towns with outdoor recreation planning and opportunities, integrating outdoor recreation into physical education programs in schools, and coordinating agency information so that it's easier for the general public to understand. The task force discussed at length the possibility of a single state-wide access pass for parking at all state and federal recreation areas.

Member Stohr commented on the work accomplished in a short timeframe, commending the work of the task force members for coordinating to provide their recommendations. He noted that the public need was well-recognized and acknowledged when the task force was discussing the issues and concerns.

Member Bloomfield inquired about congressional staff on the task force to support the work. Director Cottingham indicated that not all interest groups or key players were appointed to the task force.

Member Mayer commented on his experience at the regional and county level of parks, specifically regarding how to market and coordinate with other providers to develop passes to recreation areas. He also provided comment to the task force members, referencing statutes that place responsibility on

RCO and the board to support these goals financially in some form, being best led by RCO due to the existing authority and skill sets at the agency. Director Cottingham shared that the task force's discussion covered these ideas, but they did not take action on them in the proposed recommendations.

Member Bloomfield commented on the funding challenges and how they affect development proposals brought to voters. In smaller communities where many opportunities exist, the perception of additional taxes is often negative.

Member Willhite inquired about the use of extended technology in the task force discussions, such as applying for a Discovery Pass online or using a smart phone. Director Cottingham explained that the necessary infrastructure to support these ideas is not currently in place, limiting the options for technological innovation.

Director Cottingham shared brief updates about recent conference participation, including the National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers (NASORLO) Conference, held in Vancouver last month. RCO staff recently participated in the Washington State Trails conference, and have recently finalized a contract for a new Washington trails database; Darrell Jennings will share more about this experience during the grant management report.

RCO has hired a new executive coordinator for the Washington Invasive Species Council, Raquel Crosier, who will begin in early January. Ms. Crosier is a former member of the Washington Invasive Species Council, representing the Northwest Power and Conservation Council from 2011-2013, and is currently completing a master's degree in conservation biology at the University of New South Wales.

Director Cottingham reported on the submission of two projects for the new national Land and Water Conservation Fund Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program. She concluded by stating that RCO submitted the 2015-17 budget requests on time, following board-approved decisions from August, and a response is expected from the Governor's Office in December.

Policy Report and Legislative Preparations: Wendy Brown, Policy Director, provided information on the upcoming 2015 Legislative Session preparations. RCO has three priority areas: budget requests for 2015-17, the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) request legislation (as approved by the board in August), and board member confirmations.

Ms. Brown briefed the board on the progress of Tier 1, 2, and 3 priorities for policy, per RCO's strategic plan. In response to a clarification by Member Bloomfield, Ms. Brown and Leslie Connelly explained the purpose behind developing a conversion acquisition policy, as itemized in Tier 3.

Grant Management Report: Marguerite Austin, shared information about a grant approved for the White Horse Trail, unique due to their need to open up the area after recent tragedies in order to stimulate economic opportunities from public use and tourism.

Darrell Jennings reported on the recent Washington State Trails Conference, held on October 16-18 at the Lakeway Inn Conference Center in Bellingham. This is the state's largest and most comprehensive gathering of trail users, planners, funders, and supporters. There were more than 30 breakout sessions, field trips, and keynote presentations. RCO provides some support for planning the conference, and staff also participated in or led three breakout sessions: Darrell Jennings and Leslie Connelly presented a session on investing in outdoor recreation; Rory Calhoun hosted a session on understanding the new federal accessibility requirements for trails; Darrell Jennings participated in a panel discussion on the

career paths of trail professionals and the future of trail jobs. Other RCO staff attended and provide staff support for the conference and staffed a booth for RCO.

RCO has signed an agreement with the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) to create the first statewide geospatial database of Washington state trails and trailheads. An RCO-approved grant of \$177,636 from the Nonhighway and Off-road Vehicle Activities Program will be used by the OCIO to pull together GIS line data from federal, state, and local entities to create this database. Work is to verify and attribute as much of the line data as is possible and to make the data publically available for those who are interested in making maps and performing spatial analysis.

During yesterday's board meeting, Kim Sellers received a question from the board about the decline of farmland acreage in Washington as compared to the rest of the nation. She provided the information to the board, clarifying the numbers that demonstrate Washington's slightly more rapid decline in comparison.

Performance Report: Jen Masterson, Data and Special Projects Manager, briefed the board on the performance goals and measures for fiscal year 2015. Performance so far this fiscal year was impacted by the application process, during which grant manager's workloads were prioritized to focus on application review, site visits, and sponsor support during technical review and evaluation. Managers expect that performance will improve during the remainder of the year, when staff resume their regular grant management duties.

Ms. Masterson presented performance trends for sponsors' agreements issued and signed on time, contract closeouts, and bills paid on time. Member Mayer inquired about how lean principles are incorporated in the electronic payment processes, as well as streamlining steps for sponsors during submission of their data. Ms. Masterson explained that these principles were addressed early in the planning phases, and the board can expect to see changes that improve the efficiency and ease of the process.

A variety of factors impact the ability of projects to close on time, including the sponsor's ability to satisfy special conditions, meet requirements for barrier-free access, and whether RCO staff receive all of the required documentation in a timely manner. Member Bloomfield inquired about how this process can be improved by parsing the data to show the factors contributing to the performance metrics. Ms. Masterson explained the difficulties of incentivizing sponsors to submit their information. Director Cottingham suggested displaying the information by sponsor type in order to understand more about what barriers limit sponsor performance.

Member Mayer asked about the purpose for needing contracts closed out on time in terms of performance. Ms. Masterson explained potential impacts to staff workload, as well as issues with carrying forward allocated grant funds.

Member Herzog inquired whether post-completion inspections impact the project backlog list, specifically whether compliance issues noted during an inspection re-open a closed project. Director Cottingham noted that re-opened projects are often due to elements identified during an inspection. Myra Barker, Compliance Specialist, explained that closed projects with compliance issues are moved to a status of "active-completed" and are not included in the backlog.

General Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Item 10: State Agency Partner Reports

Washington State Parks: Member Herzog shared the new design for the Discovery Pass which will be made of more durable material. Temporary passes may be printed online, but the purpose is to guide the public towards a streamlined process that decrease individual or duplicative purchases. There is space for two vehicle license plates. He shared information about the discussions concerning fees and revenues, as well as pricing for camping in state parks and moorage in marine parks.

Member Deller commented on the issues with marine parks compliance. Member Herzog noted that this is an issue, and shared that these concerns have been identified. The solutions lean towards electronic payments forms (apps, online registration, etc.), but to date no solution is currently in place.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW): Member Stohr informed the board that WDFW is in the process of hiring a new agency director, anticipating the new recruit to begin in late December or early January. WDFW submitted their 2015-17 budget requests, focusing in part on commercial fishing fees. Member Stohr also reported that the Teanaway management plan is due at the end of the biennium; progress is going smoothly with few conflicts.

Member Stohr concluded by sharing that WDFW is attempting to resolve conflicts surrounding payment in lieu of taxes (PILT) payments. The main controversy surrounds actions taken by the Legislature, rolling back on counties that claim open space rates. A new bill would establish open space rate as a standard, and allow counties to retain fees and penalties, and keep taxes. Member Bloomfield asked if the PILT would move from treasury to DFW. Member Stohr responded that WDFW will likely retain the PILT responsibility.

Board Business: Briefings

Item 11: Feedback on the Grant Evaluation Process

Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Conservation Section Manager, briefed the board on the process for collecting information about the grant evaluation process from the evaluators. For context, she also provided an overview of the evaluation criteria and respective program policies. Following the evaluations, RCO staff conducts a post-evaluation meeting with each of the standing advisory committees. This meeting provides an opportunity for the evaluators to review the evaluation results, discuss the evaluation criteria, talk about the technical review and evaluation processes, and exchange ideas for improvements before the next grant cycle. The evaluators appreciate this opportunity and generally participate fully.

Scott Robinson, Deputy Director, announced that an upcoming survey soliciting additional feedback from applicants, volunteer evaluators and staff will be deployed in November.

Member Willhite inquired about the sustainability evaluation criteria and in which categories this is included. Ms. Austin explained that this used to be part of the design criteria for just State Parks and Local Parks, but this is the first year where it has been extended to all categories. Member Willhite furthered his comment by suggesting that this criteria also address global warming and/or climate change. Director Cottingham offered that this is possible, but would need to be appropriately stated for each category.

Member Bloomfield inquired about the possibility of extracting data from these surveys that can contribute to performance reviews. Member Mayer also believed that the evaluation results shared by Ms. Austin are critical to the performance of the agency and board. He suggested a retreat during with the board could focus on the feedback and strategically implement these suggestions.

Member Mayer asked whether the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) review panel members are compensated. Director Cottingham replied that the agency recruits the review panel members via a

Request for Proposals (RFP) process, soliciting for technical expertise, and therefore they are compensated. For the salmon recovery grants, the evaluation process uses a bottom-up approach which allows for the specialized expertise and compensation, in contrast to the state-level approach followed by the recreation and conservation grant process. Member Mayer furthered his question, asking whether this board should consider recruiting specialized reviewers for the projects' technical aspects. Director Cottingham explained that the necessary expertise is gained through staggering the review members' terms of appointment, so there is some continuity across grant rounds.

Break 10:55 a.m. – 11:05 a.m.

Board Business: Requests for Direction

Item 12: Youth Athletic Facilities Program

Leslie Connelly, Policy Specialist, updated the board on the progress of the Youth Athletic Facilities (YAF) program, including a brief history of the actions taken in July and August and a timeline for future steps and decisions to be made. A detailed timeline and proposed policies for 2015 were included in the board materials. Ms. Connelly shared proposed policy considerations, as the policies for the YAF program were last reviewed in 2003. Decisions on policy changes will be made by the board at the next meeting in April 2015.

Member Willhite inquired about an attempt to harmonize these policy considerations with other grant programs, and how staff intends to blend these elements together. Ms. Connelly explained that there are efforts to align criteria and enhance the value between grant programs while avoiding overlaps with other programs. Member Willhite furthered his comment, encouraging alignment without overlaps with other programs as much as possible.

Member Deller inquired about feedback from the Governor's Office on this request. Director Cottingham replied that no feedback has been received at this time.

Member Mayer asked if there is a match requirement for the grants in this program. Ms. Connelly explained that it is board policy to decide and RCO is proceeding on a one-to-one match assumption at this time. Director Cottingham shared that some legislators are curious about finding a way to build in census economic factors, i.e. if community is below poverty level, so that the match is on some kind of sliding scale; the board could prepare recommendations to this effect in anticipation of such a request. Member Willhite supported the suggestion, stating the importance of assisting under-served communities and those that have suffered natural disasters. Director Cottingham stated that this is achievable, but the policy should outline the criteria in a quantitative and definitive manner that is non-subjective and non-negotiable, in order to ensure consistency and fairness.

Director Cottingham clarified that this grant program is distinct from WWRP because the YAF projects do not compete well in WWRP. Member Mayer emphasized the collaboration between school districts and athletic fields, which often bring to light issues with public access to the facilities. Director Cottingham agreed that this is an issue to address.

Board Business: Decisions

Item 13: Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Phase II Public Hearing

Leslie Connelly, Policy Specialist, described the background and purpose of the Washington Administrative Code as it pertains to the structure of the agency and public records, the focus of today's public hearing. She provided a summary of the staff recommendation for amendments to the administrative rules in Chapter 286-06 of the Washington Administrative Code titled Public Records and outlined the required public review process for the adoption of the amendments.

The last time the WAC for public records was updated was 2001. It currently does not address recent changes to the Revised Code of Washington (RCW), nor does it address current modes of business such as electronic records management. The Attorney General's Office created model rules in 2007, which form the basis of RCO's proposed WAC changes.

Ms. Connelly provided a brief overview of the changes, highlighting WAC 286, Section 06-060 regarding contact information. A typo was noted in the proposed changes and a request was made to add the word "Fax" before the appropriate number in the contact information.

Ms. Connelly presented a proposed cost schedule for providing public records. Member Mayer inquired about the purpose behind services such as scanning, clarifying that it is a customer service element and not required by statute. Member Mayer also asked whether agency or state rules allow adoption by reference, rather than within the WAC specifically. Director Cottingham noted that this is the purpose behind including the actual cost schedule outside the WAC, with reference in WAC, in order to avoid needing to update the WAC each year.

Public Hearing

Chair Spanel opened the public hearing.

Public Comment

No public comment was provided at this time.

Board Discussion

Member Willhite inquired about making this a cross-agency process that is similar. Director Cottingham explained that this is why the Attorney General's Office has created model rules and RCO is following them as closely as possible. Each agency is unique and addresses public disclosure individually; there is not a universal public disclosure agency in existence. Wendy Loosle is currently RCO's Public Records Officer, and she coordinates with other agencies as much as possible to respond to public disclosure requests consistently. Member Stohr noted that electronic storage of records is costly both in storage capacity and staff time.

Chair Spanel closed the public hearing.

Ms. Connelly summarized the written public testimony for the board to consider. Attachment D, as noted in the board materials, was distributed to the board. There was one written comment received, which did not substantiate changes to the proposed WAC as set forth in the board materials. Ms. Connelly outlined the options for adopting the rules, amendments, postponement, and/or withdrawal.

Chair Spanel requested the amended resolution language to be as follows:

" NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board does hereby adopt the proposed rulemaking as filed with the Office of the Code Reviser on September 17, 2014, published October 1, 2014 in issue #14-19-116 of the Washington State Register, and as amended on October 30, 2014 by the board to add the word "Fax"; and "

Resolution 2014-31

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Pete Mayer

Resolution: APPROVED

Lunch 11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

The board went into executive session to discuss personnel matters, specifically the performance review of RCO Director Kaleen Cottingham.

Item 14: City of Bellevue, Mercer Slough Conversion

Member Herzog requested to be recused from this agenda item, identifying another State Parks staff member who can answer questions as needed in his absence.

Myra Barker, Compliance Specialist, began by explaining what constitutes a conversion and what the board's responsibilities are pertaining to conversions. Ms. Barker then provided a summary of the City of Bellevue and State Parks' request regarding the conversion of 1.06 acres at Mercer Slough Nature Park. The conversion at the Mercer Slough Nature Park is caused by the expansion of Sound Transit Light Rail system from downtown Seattle to Redmond, and full details may be found in the board materials. She briefed the board on the required criteria of the request, including location, proposed replacement property, and assessment of the proposal.

Member Mayer asked whether it is common if a substitute property to be identified as a prior acquisition. Member Mayer also asked about the number of trees referenced in the project, and inquired about what other vegetation impacts there may be from the project. Ms. Barker deferred this question to staff from the City of Bellevue, as the information is not required when a conversion request is submitted.

Chair Spanel clarified the role of the board for the audience, and then asked for public comment.

Public Comment

Geoff Bidwell, Chair of the Save the Mercer Slough Committee, provided a brief history of the committee. The committee was organized near 28 years ago specifically to protect the Mercer Slough Nature Park. He was nominated as chair, and is committed to the same cause today. He provided some history of the committee actions and their efforts to protect the nature park since the 1980s. He stated that the rail is not consistent with the long-standing plans for the park, including that the rail would diminish the aesthetic and recreation benefits of the park. He included among the impacts a number of detriments, such as loss of trees, noise issues, and negative water table effects (specifically drainage issues). He cited a report to this effect, stating that the City of Bellevue was not provided this information and it is critical to this decision. The ground water table would be dramatically impacted, affecting the storm water drainage system. He requested that the board not approve the conversion. Mr. Bidwell's testimony and referenced letters may be found at the end of this summary.

Chair Spanel asked if Mr. Bidwell has provided challenges during the City of Bellevue's planning process. He stated that he has, but has met barriers consistently or has not received feedback. He believes the information from Sound Transit definitively shows that the project would negatively impact the wetlands and this issue needs to be addressed.

Erin Powell, a resident of Bellevue, spoke on behalf of the Save the Mercer Slough Committee. She submitted a written copy of the spoken testimony shared with the board (see Appendix A).

Joseph Rosmann thanked the board for their efforts. He submitted a written copy of the spoken testimony shared with the board (see Appendix A).

William Popp, a resident of Bellevue, spoke on behalf of the Save the Mercer Slough Committee. He submitted a letter to the board (included in the "Late Arriving Public Comment" section of the board materials) which included information submitted to Sound Transit regarding alternatives of least harm that were not soundly evaluated. He responded to the allegation that there were no feasible alternatives

by quoting "B7R", a chapter from the Environmental Impact Statement for the East Link Project. He responded to the "highly complex" engineering statements, explaining that they were not accurate. He commented on the history of the project, and later found the chapter B7R to be feasible.

Chair Spanel asked if Mr. Popp had submitted an appeal to the City of Bellevue. Mr. Popp responded that he had not, but referenced a lawsuit that challenged the ROD. He commented on the trail constructed near the park will be truncated, and the recreational opportunities will be lost.

Alan Smith declined to provide comment, stating that the others who have spoken have covered similar issues that he intended to address.

Renay Bennett, a resident of Bellevue, spoke on behalf of the Save the Mercer Slough Committee and others who could not make it today. She submitted a written copy of the spoken testimony shared with the board (see Appendix A).

Bruce Nurse is a local resident and serves in a public affairs capacity in Lincoln Square, a downtown shopping center in Bellevue. Mr. Nurse responded to the comments provided in the preceding public testimony regarding least harm alternatives and business impacts. He asserted that Sound Transit is not fully considering viable alternatives, nor the potential mitigation of negative impacts. He stated that it would not be appropriate for the board to make a decision under pressure at this time, and suggested that the decision be delayed. Mr. Nurse has visited and enjoyed the park to great extent, grateful for its proximity. He thanked the board for the opportunity to provide comment.

Will Knedlik, President of the Eastside Rail Now, an environmental and rail advocacy organization. Mr. Knedlik shared that he resides north of Bellevue, which is important to note because the park serves as a regional resource for people beyond the citizens of Bellevue. He is concerned about the water table issues, but refrained from further comment as others have shared it in their testimony. He stated that other options exist and should be considered; Sound Transit has not provided the information necessary to make this decision. The value of the park as a resource has not been fully expressed, and the negative impacts have not been adequately dealt with in the proposal. The replacement property is not adequate enough to balance the value of the park as it currently exists. He asserted that testimony received by the Sound Transit regarding track vehicles exposes assets to degradation, and they would have to pay more for use of the bridge. This is important because the board should ensure that the reversion potential is irrevocable, and that the value and potential use is equivalent. He urged the board to assert whatever authority they may have to deny this request.

Elma Borbe, an environmental planner with Sound Transit, and **Camron Parker**, City of Bellevue Parks and Community Services Senior Planner, were asked to come forth and address the water and drainage issues brought forth in previous public testimony.

The preliminary design was issued as part of conceptual engineering at 10% analysis, which was an initial step provided in 2010. In 2010 the preliminary design was not adequate; however, much progress has been made since that time. The technical details of the trench have been updated, and now at 90% analysis the engineers believe that the design will not de-water the slough, appropriately maintaining existing storm-water flows. She stated that they changed the design to address these issues. Annotated drawings have been provided as part of the (late arriving) public comment. Mr. Parker stated that the designs have been submitted to the City at various percentages, and they are available upon request to the public.

Ms. Borbe stated that any issues that come up are coordinated in weekly public meetings. Member Mayer asked if the Parks Board has taken a position on these issues, and asked for a response to the park's

master plan, as to whether the city council has allowed a vote on this alignment. Mr. Parker stated that the City has not chosen to use various boards and commissions to provide feedback nor taken a formal position on East Link project. The process has been lengthy, with opportunity for public comment, and decisions were made in 2011 on the project.

Member Deller responded to Mr. Knedlik's request to consider a reversion, should plans for the light rail not be completed. Director Cottingham added that it is not part of RCO's policy. Ms. Barker stated that it's within the board's authority to determine whether all practical alternatives were considered, and suggested that the board reject the proposal and allow the requestors to provide additional information and details on alternatives considered and mitigation of impacts.

Member Mayer also agreed with Mr. Knedlik; however, there was not sufficient information provided during his testimony regarding the trench and potential consequences of the design as to whether it falls under the purview of the board. Mr. Parker used a map to explain the intended project and anticipated impacts, explaining the proposed infrastructure and placement.

Member Mayer re-stated his question about vegetation impacts. Mr. Parker replied, stating that 120 trees will be removed, and more along the length of the park. South of the park-and-ride, a mitigation project outside of the boundaries will be removed for wetland restoration and allow for tree planning. Member Mayer asked about tree replanting requirements. Mr. Parker said that the permit process is still in progress, and is unsure of the ratios.

Member Mayer asked about the mitigation or plans to regenerate vegetation in the conversion area during the temporary construction easement, given the length of time. The limitations in the plan discuss buffers for the rail and for the wetland area.

Member Willhite thanked members of the public for attending. He asked about the hearing examiner and court of appeals, specifically whether they upheld the right to proceed in their final rulings. Ms. Borbe responded, stating that Sound Transit reported exploring all viable alternatives, and that they included the forest devaluation. Additionally, the Department of the Interior sent a letter in which they concurred with the review, and reaffirmed the analysis as sound. She explained that the courts sided with Sound Transit; the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was upheld by the courts.

Member Willhite asked if new or different information was provided by the public which causes a change in opinion from testimony offered in any of the appeals process (Hearing Examiner or Court of Appeals). Was the tunneling option discussed in these courts? The EIS did not consider a tunnel alternative. Although Sound Transit was challenged on the range of alternatives, the court system determined that they had an adequate range, and conceded that tunneling is too expensive.

Director Cottingham reminded the board of the Arboretum conversion request, and recommended delegating the final authority to the director. Member Mayer stated that it would be in the interest of the board to ensure that if the conversion were approved, that the park would be assured to remain consistent with its original purpose. He asked that Ms. Barker clarify where the final decision's authority exists. If the board denied the conversion, what would happen? Ms. Barker replied that staff wouldn't proceed and would not have a recommendation for the park service. She would ask direction on how to proceed and under what conditions.

Member Stohr asked for clarification on the content of the legal decisions before the court and the results, to understand how different options were delivered and evaluated, more about the hydrological issues, and what the board authority truly is. Director Cottingham asked about timeline for Sound Transit's

intended plans. Ms. Borbe explained that Sound Transit intended construction to begin in 2016, and they would need approval prior to that time.

Member Mayer stated that the cost is not the criteria which the board needs to consider (referring to the tunneling option), and therefore concerns about alternative options being too costly are not considered.

Member Deller expressed his interest in reversion discussions, including the appropriateness of this conversion. Should the rail plans change, he explained, some kind of reversion language would be necessary. Director Cottingham suggested deferring this decision until the April 2015 meeting, allowing time for exploration of the potential recreation, vegetation and environmental impacts under proposed conversion.

Mr. Parker described in more detail the proposed plans and potential impacts. Mr. Parker referred to two maps in the RCO staff presentation that included a satellite map with overlay of proposed areas under conversion and a conceptual map to show intended changes.

Member Mayer asked about alternative options for the rail system. Mr. Parker and Ms. Borbe addressed these questions, describing the least harm alternatives considered and reasons for the proposed plan. This was additional public comment and should be referenced as such. Mr. Rosmann shared history of the map under consideration, being from 2007, and shared the previous plans that conflict with the current plan proposed. He stated that the map does not represent an accurate depiction of what the rail system would impact. He described the current plan impacts in more detail and seasonal impacts.

The board discussed potential language for motion to defer this decision to a later date pending more information. Member Deller clarified that the role of the board is to determine the appropriateness of the conversion. He suggested that the board delay the decision until further information is obtained to make a more sound decision. Member Willhite seconded this suggestion, stating that they cannot take sides, but most focus on the appropriateness of conversion of property. Member Bloomfield expressed that there is room for examining alternative options for the conversion, even within the confines of the previous court decisions.

Member Mayer moved to table the decision to approve the Conversion for Mercer Slough Nature Park (RCO Projects #73-026 and 78-513) to the April 2015 meeting of the RCFB board pending additional information on the impacts to conversion areas, with regards to hydrological impacts, recreation use, species and habitat impacted, as well as opportunities relative to ensuring reversion right should the proposed alignment change.

Break 2:48 p.m. – 2:55 p.m.

Resolution 2014-32

Moved by: Member Pete Mayer

Seconded by: Member Mike Deller

Resolution: DEFERRED to the April 2015 meeting

Item 15: Board Survey and Strategic Plan

Director Cottingham outlined the staff proposal for conducting the end of the year Recreation and Conservation Funding Board survey and updating the board's strategic plan in preparation for the 2015-17 biennium. The survey is open to the board to provide feedback; currently it focuses on board meetings and preparations. The strategic plan is included in the board materials, last updated in 2012.

Member Mayer proposed the idea of a board retreat and Director Cottingham suggested using the first day (April 8th) of the scheduled April 2015 meeting as a possible date. Member Mayer suggested forming a subcommittee to continue progress and prepare an agenda for a retreat. Member Deller appreciated the simplicity of the current plan, and that it's aligned with the Governor's plan. He suggested following the same biennial guideline to avoid constant updates, allowing focus for longer durations on the work at hand. Director Cottingham reminded the board of the priorities presented in the policy report, and suggested not bulking up the plan too far beyond the currently identified actions. She suggested a one-day business meeting and a one-day retreat in April, since the approved 2015 schedule allows for two days.

Member Willhite brought up two issues. First, there is need to address grant program policy in regards to climate change. Second, he asked how the board could support communities in need that have suffered natural disasters, which may require some statutory changes.

Member Mayer would like to add metrics that measure accountability and planning across programs, ensuring that resources are used effectively, policies address gaps, and services are efficient. Director Cottingham noted that performance goals do need to be addressed, and Member Mayer's suggestions could be included. Member Bloomfield suggested adding these concerns in an agenda format in order to address them in an appropriate setting, whether at a retreat or regular business meeting, and evaluate the grant categories as needed.

Member Willhite suggested deferring all questions from the public and media to the chair, as a speaking person for the board to respond to questions that may come from the public. A sub-committee may be formed to prepare an agenda to address the issues raised today, comprised of Harriet Spanel, Peter Mayer, Betsy Bloomfield, and Ted Willhite. RCO staff will submit the code reviser's notice to schedule day one (April 8) as a retreat and planning session.

Director Cottingham suggested adjusting the survey for the board members to allow for data collection that will support planning for the retreat.

Director Cottingham also reminded the board members February 10, 2015 is the usual date for the WWRC Reception at the Governor's Mansion, although they are looking for an alternate location or date.

Member Deller shared the recent report published for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Closing

The meeting was adjourned at 3:33 p.m. by Chairwoman Chair Spanel.

Approved by:



Harriet Chair Spanel, Chair



Date

Appendix A

Item 14 – Public Comment

Erin Powell

“Good Afternoon, My name is Erin Powell, I am a Bellevue resident, a Parks and Community Services Board member with the City of Bellevue, and a Parks and Recreation professional, however I am speaking on behalf of Save the Mercer Slough Committee. “Mercer Slough Nature Park - 33 years and \$11 Million dollars after its first acquisition in the slough the City of Bellevue had assembled WHAT MAY BE THE BIGGEST AND BEST URBAN WETLANDS PARK IN THE UNITED STATES.” The Seattle Times. City of Bellevue- your grant recipient from 1973 and 1978 has lost its’ direction and specifically its’ Moral Compass direction because Bellevue is willing to sacrifice Mercer Slough Nature Parks’ entire western boarder of Bellevue Way SE and 112th Ave parklands, and allow Mercer Slough Nature Park to become the location of a rail road structure and related facilities that will adversely affect the public’s access and enjoyment of the Mercer Slough Nature Park. Current and future generations of people should be able to enjoy the valuable trails, wetlands, National Historic Winter’s House, the majestic significant trees and the overall green tree views along Bellevue Way and 112th, also the historic blueberry farm lands, farm and garden facilities without seeing, hearing and experiencing the disruptive intrusion of the Eastlink Light Rail train rolling by every 3 to 7 minutes 18 to 20 hours a day 365 days of the year. The value and enjoyment of the recreation experience is interrupted and the human senses assaulted by this railroad activity within the Mercer Slough Nature Park. Access to the park will be cut off because there will be railroad tracks and a trench 40 feet wide along Bellevue Way – half a mile in length-the whole length of Mercer Slough Nature Park . A security fence and the tracks themselves will block people from accessing the park along this rail corridor, where 1,279 significant trees will be cut down - devastating the tree canopy that provides shade in the summers and habitat for animals . The one and only proposed access point is next to the Winter’s House which will take even more parkland to provide space for the new parking lot, farm and garden operation, restroom facilities, this will eliminate and pave over even more acreage of Mercer Slough wetlands parkland. The recent Moon/Ross property purchase by the City of Bellevue has functioned as continuous open space that helped keep habitat and wetlands to thrive. Mercer Slough has enjoyed the undeveloped environmental benefits of this property for decades and the purchase of the property has been a goal and now a reality – This purchase is to be applauded. However, this site is not as valuable as the entire western boarder along Mercer Slough because it is NOT the GATEWAY INTO BELLEVUE NOR IS IT THE GATEWAY TO THE MERCER SLOUGH NATURE PARK, it is far away from large neighborhoods of people, existing trails, Winter’s House, blueberry fields, and farm and garden operation, and the trails linking our beloved National Scenic Byway trails of the Mountain to Sound Greenway system. Mercer Slough Nature Park is a large park experience-which THOUSANDS of people visit daily- it is easily accessed by families and school children from around the region who participate in environmental education programs. Mercer Slough is a destination nature park experience where children can explore, learn and have fun. What a wonderful investment in public lands that help develop future generations who will care and take action to save our environment for the future.

In 2009 the City of Bellevue cancelled building a new trail on the north side of Mercer Slough, a trail that had been in the Master Plan for some time - before the 2011 MOU was signed – Were agreements made before our democratic processes and system of government weighted in on these most important decisions? Just because we can build, something doesn’t mean we should. Bellevue and Sound Transit must do better than selecting to destroy these loved public park facilities, destroy habitat for the threatened Western Pond Turtle, native fish and salmon, threatened migratory birds, and risk the healthy richness of our wetland ecosystem.

We only have one earth; we only have one chance to get this monumental decision right for the good of the people and for the good of the integrity of publically held public open spaces that were

so hard won. The people of Bellevue, King County and the Federal Government did create -THE BIGGEST AND BEST URBAN WETLANDS PARK IN THE UNITED STATES. LET'S KEEP IT! HELP US KEEP IT! I am asking you to protect and conserve Mercer Slough Nature Park public lands into perpetuity as they are today. Mercer Slough Nature Park is a very special place that helps define us as a democratic people- Americans respect past generations' visions and hard work that bought this public lands in the first place. Americans exercise good stewardship of our responsibilities and obligations for these public lands today and always. PLEASE help us conserve all of our Mercer Slough Nature Park. Please Deny this conversion request – Alternative rail alignments are available you have examples in your packets. Thank you."

Joseph Rosmann

"Good afternoon Chair Spanel, Director Cottingham, and members of the Board. I am Joseph Rosmann, a Bellevue citizen living in the Surrey Downs community adjacent to the Mercer Slough Nature Park. Our extended Rosmann family is well known across the US for its work in advancing the goals of sustainable agriculture, protecting agricultural workers from chemicals and other substance risks, and preserving natural wildlife, including salmon, trout, and other at-risk fish. I operate a general contracting business that serves businesses and homeowners throughout the Seattle Eastside. We utilize the services of hydrologists, geotechnical engineers, soils engineers, structural engineers, and other similar experts in the course of serving our clients. These experts are knowledgeable regarding the character and natural environment of the Mercer Slough Nature Park, the height of the water table there and the construction challenges to be faced there. These experts have examined the report provided by CH2MHill to Sound Transit, dated April 5, 2010. They concur with the findings and advice of CH2MHill to Sound Transit regarding the likelihood of dewatering of the wetlands between Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue and Mercer Slough creek. Because Sound Transit is utilizing a closed-floor trench structure, whose base is well below the water table, build-up of water on the west side of Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue must be relieved using siphons under the trench as well as rock strainer structures. Unfortunately, these strainers can be expected to fill with siltation over time, making the siphons even more necessary. The water build up must be released eastward in large quantities via use of drainage trenches placed between the rail line and Mercer Slough Creek. During the dryer half of each year this drainage will eliminate the essential sources of water that would normally maintain the function of the wetlands located throughout the west side of Mercer Slough Nature Park. This is the essence of the dewatering effects on the Mercer Slough wetlands as set out in CH2MHill's report. This dewatering will lead to losses of endangered Western Sand turtles, and will dramatically diminish the nutrients (insects, worms, and other flora and fauna) that are essential to sustaining the travel of spawning salmon in Mercer Slough. You also have before you a letter from Dr. Don Davidson. Dr. Davidson could not be here today so he asked that I share the following with you. He has many reasons to understand these issues. He serves as Vice Chairman of the Puget Sound Salmon Recovery Council and is Chairman of the Lake Washington, Lake Sammamish and Cedar River Salmon Recovery Council. In his letter he states that these two Councils consider the Mercer Slough Nature Park, and its upstream Kelsey Creek Watershed, to be pre-eminent among all the salmon spawning areas in the greater Seattle area. He wrote that "it is essential that the Mercer Slough Nature Park waterways and wetlands not be compromised in any way such that this extremely important salmon propagation environment be destroyed." His letter further states that The Mercer Slough wetland functions will be permanently damaged thereby impeding the passage of several spawning salmon species. The Mercer Slough is the only way in which returning spawning salmon can reach the upstream Kelsey Creek Watershed areas where salmon eggs are extensively laid. Sound Transit's plan will likewise permanently destroy many hundreds of trees, and other vegetation and flora and fauna that provide essential nutrients for the returning salmon. Dr. Davidson has shared his letter with the other funding board that the RCO office supports, the Washington State Salmon Recovery Financing board. In his work with the two Councils he works closely with this equally important state oversight board Members of the Washington State Salmon Recovery Financing Board

share Dr. Davidson's understanding regarding the importance of the Mercer Slough Nature Park to the recovery of salmon in the Puget Sound Region. He therefore asks that, before you take any action today, that you confer with your colleagues on the Washington State salmon recovery financing board. Dr. Davidson and I also ask you today to consider two other important facts. First, as you heard and seen, there is a better alternative for bringing Eastlink into the City of Bellevue. Sound Transit's leaders have refused to study this alternative, even though their own engineering and financing staff experts recommended to them in October of 2012 that they do so. Sound Transit's in-house experts recommended then that this alternative be evaluated because Sound Transit had been having such great success with bored tunnels in Seattle. Second, you should also know that Sound Transit has never provided the Bellevue City Council with its final plans for mitigating the environmental impacts on the environment of Mercer Slough Nature Park. Sound Transit holds the results of the 90% engineering requirements and plans for the Mercer Slough Nature Park area. Bellevue City Council members have repeatedly requested that Sound Transit provide this vital information to them. Sound Transit refuses to do so. We know that Sound Transit can change their decisions when cost and environmental factors outweigh prior considerations. They did so in Seattle. Seven years after having received the Federal Record of Decision for the Northlink rail line, placed at grade, Sound Transit chose to build Northlink using a bored tunnel. Equity for the Mercer Slough Nature Park environment and its wildlife, for the users of the Park, and for our Bellevue citizens must be provided."

Renay Bennett

"When you change a park master plan, there is a specific process that is followed with lots of public involvement. None of that has occurred with this massive change in the Mercer Slough. In the FEIS, over 70% of the public comments opposed placing this train in the Mercer Slough. I am sure that our citizens would be equally opposed to a major taking of valuable park land downgrading the entire park had they been given the opportunity. In fact, in all the numerous public meetings held by Bellevue and Sound Transit, and I was at every single one of them, each and every meeting showed massive opposition to this decimation of the Mercer Slough. Washington families need to know that when their tax dollars are used for parks land it should stay park land. This is trading down the entire west side for a sliver of property that has already been promised to Bellevue taxpayers and approved in a parks bond, has a trail already running through it, is unbuildable, and is already being used as part of the Slough. Please save our Slough for now and our future and deny this conversion."

William Popp

I am here to speak on behalf of the Save the Mercer Slough Committee. I want to point out things in the staff report that you need to consider before taking your action.

There is an e-mail in your materials from me that covers the issues associated with outright avoidance of the Federal Department of Transportation's Section 4f rule about evaluation of the least harm alternative. The City of Bellevue attorney had pointed this out in a letter to Sound Transit and was subsequently over ridden by her boss. Another letter was issued that said we can mitigate this away.

I have been in the transportation business over 45 years on the governmental and the private sector side and I know when an evaluation has occurred and when it has not and in this case there are alternatives that were not soundly evaluated. And this keys directly into your policies and page 4 of the staff report that there were no feasible and prudent alternatives.

I submit that there was a feasible and prudent alternative called B7R that was funded by the City of Bellevue and rejected for purely political reasons by Sound Transit as the alignment did not support Transit Oriented Development opportunities. And that feasible alternative, as it relates to your role, presented a huge windfall by returning the existing 11.5 acre park and ride lot to the City for park use in the most park accessible location possible. Now there is another alternative – a tunnel alignment which Rossman mentioned Sound Transit is refusing to consider.

The RCFB memo page 4 offers reasons for not considering alternatives to avoid Mercer Slough Nature Park as requiring substantial property relocations or highly complex engineering. I submit that what Sound Transit is doing is highly complex engineering. B7R was not highly complex and neither is the tunnel alignment. What is highly complex is trying to run this train through the wetland and peat environment and trying to protect the wetlands from dewatering.

That same 11.5 acre windfall can be had with a tunnel alignment as well and to date there has been no movement in that direction. But there can be. I have been around long enough, and the Chairman as well, and we can recall the RH Thompson Expressway in Seattle that was on the plan for years and was 100% designed. I went to the Puget Sound Council of Governments in 1969 and the movement had started – no more freeways and an expressway in the Arboretum certainly did not belong.

I want to correct a statement I made in the e-mail to you that is in your packets. I said that the B7R alignment was politically unrealistic, but in reflection on the issue and past events that is not true. This board should not be cowed by the notion that the train is coming down the track and you are simply in the way.

Or putting it another way I am reminded of Clint Eastwood in "Unforgiven" when he told the bad guys you don't have to do this you know. Of course they came back and were killed, but you don't have to do this you know.

Question from the Chairperson: Did you go through an appeal process to Sound Transit or the City on all this?

Answer: I did not personally but there was a lawsuit that challenged the ROD and that was rejected. But interestingly the lawsuit did not challenge on the basis of the 11.5 acre park opportunity.

I have of course made a number of presentations to the Council over the years about problems with this corridor. But in this case we do have a recreational facility in that corridor (that I have not addressed). My wife and I enjoy walking that westside trail and as mentioned earlier, the trail was to extend north along the edge of the waterway. It would have been a very attractive facility and now the route will be truncated.

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2014-18
October 2014 Consent Calendar**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following October 2014 Consent Calendar items are approved:

- A. Approve Board Meeting Minutes – July 17-18, 2014
- B. Approve Board Meeting Minutes – August 26, 2014
- C. Approve Board Meeting Dates and Locations for 2015
- D. Approve Time Extensions:
 - 08-1175 Acquisition: Bone and Niawiakum River Natural Area Preserves
 - 08-1177 Acquisition: Cypress Island Natural Area 2008
 - 07-1974 Acquisition and Development: Malaga Community Park

Resolution moved by: Pete Mayer

Resolution seconded by: Ted Willhite

Adopted Date: October 29, 2014

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2014-19
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Local Parks Category, 2015-17, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for the 2015-2017 biennium, seventy Local Parks category projects are being considered for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, all seventy Local Parks category projects meet program eligibility requirements as stipulated in *Manual 10a, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program – Outdoor Recreation Account*, and

WHEREAS, these Local Parks category projects were evaluated by a team of citizens and local agency representatives using evaluation criteria approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board), thereby supporting the board's goal to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in open public meetings as part of the competitive selection process outlined in Washington Administrative Code 286-04-065, thereby supporting the board's strategy to ensure that its work is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner; and

WHEREAS, the projects involve acquisition, development, and/or renovation of properties for recreation, thereby supporting board priorities in the 2013 State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan and the board's strategy to provide partners with funding to enhance recreation opportunities statewide;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby approves the preliminary ranked list of projects depicted in *Table 1 – WWRP, Local Parks Category, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects, 2015-17*; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board hereby recommends to the Governor the ranked list of Local Parks category projects for further consideration.

Resolution moved by: Pete Mayer

Resolution seconded by: Mike Deller

Adopted Date: October 29, 2014

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2014-20
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
State Lands Development and Renovation Category, 2015-17,
Preliminary Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for the 2015-2017 biennium, eleven State Lands Development and Renovation category projects are being considered for funding from the Outdoor Recreation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, all eleven State Lands Development and Renovation category projects meet program eligibility requirements as stipulated in *Manual 10a, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program- Outdoor Recreation Account*, and

WHEREAS, these State Lands Development and Renovation category projects were evaluated by a team of citizens and local and state agency representatives using criteria approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board), thereby supporting the board's goal to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred through a written evaluation process as part of the competitive selection process outlined in Washington Administrative Code 286-04-065, thereby supporting the board's strategy to ensure that its work is conducted with integrity in a fair and open manner; and

WHEREAS, the projects involve development and renovation of public access sites on state lands, thereby supporting the board's strategy to provide partners with funding to enhance recreation opportunities statewide;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby approves the preliminary ranked list of projects depicted in *Table 1 – WWRP, State Lands Development and Renovation Category, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects, 2015-17*, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board hereby recommends to the Governor the ranked list of State Lands Development and Renovation category projects for further consideration.

Resolution moved by: Mike Deller

Resolution seconded by: Don Hoch

Adopted Date: October 29, 2014

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
REVISED Resolution #2014-24
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Riparian Protection Account, 2015-17, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects

WHEREAS, for the 2015-2017 biennium, twelve Riparian Protection Account projects are being considered for funding from the Riparian Protection Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, all twelve Riparian Protection Account projects meet program eligibility requirements as stipulated in *Manual 10b, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program: Habitat Conservation and Riparian Protection Accounts*; and

WHEREAS, these Riparian Protection Account projects were evaluated by a team of citizens and state and local agency representatives using criteria approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) that considers the riparian habitat benefits and relationship to existing plans, thereby supporting the board's goal to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting as part of the competitive selection process outlined in Washington Administrative Code 286-04-065, thereby supporting the board's strategy to ensure that its work is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner; and

WHEREAS, the projects include acquisitions that provide habitat benefits for a variety of species, thereby supporting the board's strategy to provide partners with funding for projects that help sustain Washington's biodiversity; protect "listed" species, and maintain fully functioning ecosystems;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby approves the ranked list of projects depicted in *Table 1 – WWRP, Riparian Protection Account, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects, 2015-17*, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board hereby recommends to the Governor the ranked list of Riparian Protection Account projects for further consideration, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board hereby authorizes the director to request a budget proviso or LEAP footnote to the effect that, "If additional funds are available, after funding the Riparian Protection Account (RPA) projects approved by the Legislature, the board may use these additional RPA funds for projects that are on the 2014 WWRP Riparian Protection Account ranked list previously approved by the Legislature."

Resolution moved by: Betsy Bloomfield

Resolution seconded by: Mike Deller

Adopted Date: October 29, 2014

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2014-28
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
State Lands Restoration and Enhancement Category, 2015-17, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for the 2015-17 biennium, twelve State Lands Restoration and Enhancement category projects are being considered for funding from the Habitat Conservation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, all twelve State Lands Restoration and Enhancement category projects meet program eligibility requirements as stipulated in *Manual 10b, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program: Habitat Conservation and Riparian Protection Accounts*, including criteria regarding public benefit and relationship to established plans; and

WHEREAS, these State Lands Restoration and Enhancement category projects were evaluated by a team of citizens and agency representatives using criteria approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board), thereby supporting the board's goal to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred through a written evaluation process approved by the board as part of the competitive selection process outlined in Washington Administrative Code 286-04-065, thereby, supporting the board's strategy to ensure that its work is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner; and

WHEREAS, the projects restore existing state lands to self-sustaining functionality, and their evaluation included the quality and function of the habitat, longer-term viability, and demonstrated need, thereby supporting the board's objectives to help sponsors maximize the useful life of board-funded projects and to fund projects that maintain fully functioning ecosystems;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby approves the ranked list of projects depicted in *Table 1 – WWRP, State Lands Restoration and Enhancement Category, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects, 2015-17*; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board hereby recommends to the Governor the ranked list of State Lands Restoration and Enhancement category projects for further consideration.

Resolution moved by: Betsy Bloomfield

Resolution seconded by: Ted Willhite

Adopted Date: October 29, 2014

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2014-29
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Urban Wildlife Habitat Category, 2015-17, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for the 2015-2017 biennium, seven Urban Wildlife Habitat category projects are being considered for funding from the Habitat Conservation Account of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, all seven Urban Wildlife Habitat category projects meet program eligibility requirements as stipulated in Manual 10b, *Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program: Habitat Conservation and Riparian Protection Accounts*, including criteria regarding public benefit and relationship to established plans; and

WHEREAS, these Urban Wildlife Habitat category projects were evaluated by a team of citizens and state and local agency representatives using criteria approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board), thereby supporting the board's goal to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in an open public meeting as part of the competitive selection process outlined in Washington Administrative Code 286-04-065, thereby supporting the board's strategy to ensure that its work is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner; and

WHEREAS, the projects address a variety of habitat needs, and the evaluation included information about the quality and function of the habitat and the demonstrated need to protect it for fish and/or wildlife, thereby supporting the board's strategy to provide partners with funding for projects that help sustain Washington's biodiversity, protect "listed" species, and maintain fully functioning ecosystems;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby approves the ranked list of projects depicted in *Table 1 – WWRP, Urban Wildlife Habitat Category, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects, 2015-17*; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board hereby recommends to the Governor the ranked list of Urban Wildlife Habitat category projects for further consideration.

Resolution moved by: Pete Mayer

Resolution seconded by: Betsy Bloomfield

Adopted Date: October 29, 2014

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2014-30
Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account
2015-17 Preliminary Ranked List of Projects**

WHEREAS, for the 2015-17 biennium, twenty-three Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) program projects are being considered for funding; and

WHEREAS, all twenty-three ALEA projects meet program eligibility requirements as stipulated in Manual 21, *Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Grant Program*; and

WHEREAS, these ALEA projects were evaluated by a team of citizens and state and local agency representatives using evaluation criteria approved by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board), thereby supporting the board's goal to fund the best projects as determined by the evaluation process; and

WHEREAS, these evaluations occurred in open public meetings as party of the competitive selection process outlined in Washington Administrative Code 286-04-065, thereby supporting the board's strategy to ensure that its work is conducted with integrity and in a fair and open manner; and

WHEREAS, the projects enhance, improve, or protect aquatic lands and provide public access to such lands and associated waters, thereby supporting policies in the 2013 State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan and the board's strategy to provide partners with funding for both conservation and recreation opportunities statewide;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board hereby approves the ranked list of projects depicted in *Table 1 – Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account, Preliminary Ranked List of Projects, 2015-17*; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board hereby recommends to the Governor the ranked list of ALEA projects for further consideration.

Resolution moved by: Pete Mayer

Resolution seconded by: Ted Willhite

Adopted Date: October 29, 2014

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2014-32
Approving Conversion for Mercer Slough Nature Park
(RCO Projects #73-026 and 78-513)**

WHEREAS, the City of Bellevue and Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission used state bond funds and a grant from the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to acquire land to expand the Mercer Slough Nature Park; and

WHEREAS, the construction of Sound Transit's Light Rail project will convert of a portion of the property; and

WHEREAS, as a result of this conversion, a portion of 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 with property purchased under a waiver of retroactivity; and

WHEREAS, the proposed replacement property is in close proximity to the conversion sites, has an appraised value that is greater than the conversion site, and has greater acreage than the conversion sites; and

WHEREAS, the site will provide opportunities that closely match those displaced by the conversion, will consolidate public ownership in the park's overall boundary, and meets needs that have been identified in the city's comprehensive plan as acquiring land adjacent to existing community parks, expanding wetland preservation of wildlife habitat, thereby supporting the board's goals to provide funding for projects that result in public outdoor recreation purposes; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board approves the conversion request and the proposed replacement site for RCO Projects #73-026 and 78-513 as presented to the board in October 2014 and set forth in the board memo prepared for that meeting; and

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the board hereby authorizes the RCO director to give interim approval for the property acquired with LWCF funds and forward the conversion to the National Park Service (NPS) for final approval.

Resolution deferment moved by: Pete Mayer

Resolution deferment seconded by: Mike Deller

Deferred Date: October 30, ~~2015~~2014*

**Revised on August 23, 2016 to correct the typo listing "2015" and to reflect the correct deferral date of "2014," as noted in the meeting minutes.*