

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARIZED AGENDA & ACTIONS
November 18-19, 2015

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up
1. Consent Calendar A. Volunteer Recognition for Advisory Committees	Resolution 2015-20 Decision: Approved	No follow-up action requested.
2. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes – September 16-17, 2015	Motion: Approved, November 18, 2015	No follow-up action requested.
3. Director’s Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director’s Report • Legislative, Budget, and Policy Update • Grant Management Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Featured Projects • Fiscal Report (<i>written only</i>) • Performance Report (<i>written only</i>) 	Briefings	No follow-up action requested.
4. State Agency Partner Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Natural Resources • State Parks and Recreation Commission • Department of Fish and Wildlife 	Briefings	Member Herzog will provide an update at the next meeting regarding State Parks’ acquisitions and planning process.
5. Youth Athletic Facilities Grant Awards	Resolution 2015-21 Decision: Approved	No follow up action requested.
6. Land and Water Conservation Fund Legacy Program Awards	Briefing Resolution 2015-22 Decision: Withdrawn	The board requested that staff provide updates regarding the National Park Service notice.
7. Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group: Overview & Current Status	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
8. Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee: Summary of Recent Reports and New Assignment Relating to Public Lands	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
9. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Review Update	Briefing	Staff will continue to brief the board during the legislative session.
10. Proposed Changes to the Grant Program Evaluation Criteria for 2016	Request for Direction	No follow-up action requested. Staff will bring the final changes for board decision to the February 2016 meeting.
11. Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Farmland Preservation Evaluation Criteria and Policies	Resolution 2015-23 Decision: Approved	No follow-up action requested.

Item	Formal Action	Board Request for Follow-up
12. Changes to the Grant Programs for 2015-17	Resolution 2015-24 Decision: Approved	No follow-up action requested.
13. Communications Plan Update	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
14. Board Member Discussion About Revising Their Strategic Plan and Performance Measures	Briefing	Members will provide any ideas for changes performance measures to the Deputy Director prior to January 1, 2016.
15. Recreation and Conservation Planning Next Steps	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
16. Scoping of Climate Change Policy	Request for Direction	The board formed a subcommittee consisting of Members Stohr and Willhite to assist staff in advance of the February 2016 meeting.
17. Compliance		
A. Overview of Conversion and Allowable Use Policies	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
B. Vancouver Water Works Park (RCO #84-9015D) Resolution 2015-25	Resolution 2015-25 Decision: Approved	No follow-up action requested.
C. Mountlake Terrace Jack Long Park (RCO 68-096A, #68-099D) Resolution 2015-26	Resolution 2015-26 Decision: Approved	No follow-up action requested.
D. Clark County Lewis River Greenway (RCO #96-074A)	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.
E. City of Spokane Riverfront Storm water Combined Sewer Overflow (RCO #72-040)	Briefing	No follow-up action requested.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: November 18, 2015

Place: Olympia, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members:

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

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 9:02 am. Staff called roll and a quorum was determined. Member Herzog was excused.

Member Willhite moved to approve the November 2015 meeting agenda; Member Deller seconded. Motion carried.

Item 1: Consent Calendar

The board reviewed the Consent Calendar, Resolution 2015-20. This resolution included recognizing the volunteers who participated on various grant program advisory committees. Chair Spanel read each volunteer name, acknowledging their efforts and thanking them for their service.

Resolution 2015-20

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Betsy Bloomfield

Resolution: Approved

Item 2: Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

Member Mayer moved to approve the September 2015 meeting minutes; Member Deller seconded. Motion carried.

Item 3: Director's Report

Director's Report: Director Kaleen Cottingham shared several staffing changes that have occurred over the past few months. RCO has two new grant managers and is recruiting for a new performance management analyst to replace Jennifer Masterson and a new fiscal analyst to replace Brent Hedden. Promotions include Adam Cole to position of policy specialist.

In preparation for the new *No Child Left Inside* grant program, staff launched webpages and assembled the materials and processes needed to guide the grant program. RCO hopes to open the application period later this year and begin funding projects in spring 2016. State Parks and RCO have signed an interagency agreement that outlines how the agencies will work together to manage the grant program.

Director Cottingham shared that the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) was not reauthorized by sunset deadline. Congress is considering a bill that would shift funding to provide states assistance, but does so by cutting funding from other programs. RCO is monitoring the progress of this program as well as the Recreational Trails Program (RTP).

Legislative Update: Director Cottingham shared information about the RCO-request legislation for 2016, including the reauthorization of the Invasive Species Council, Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group and a placeholder for potential statutory changes resulting from the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program review that will wrap up at the end of the month. Director Cottingham further updated the board on a supplemental capital budget request for increased spending authority in BFP and NOVA resulting from the 2015 gas tax increase and changes in House capital budget committee leadership; the chair is now Representative Steve Tharinger.

Grant Management Report: Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Conservation Section Manager, provided an update on the work of the grants team. She expressed appreciation and commended their efforts, which includes preparing about 290 project agreements. Ms. Austin also described the new role of Karl Jacobs, who now serves as Senior Outdoor Grant Manager for the Recreation and Conservation Section.

Darrell Jennings briefed the board on the meetings of various trails trainings and stakeholder groups, including the WTA and non-motorized highways groups. Ms. Austin and several grant managers have been involved in provided training and presentations at conferences to support grant-writing and trails-advocacy efforts. Mr. Jennings provided an update on the Washington Trails Plan, approved by the board in 2013.

Member Mayer asked whether funding is available for an online Washington trails map, where funding may come from, and what efforts are being taken to secure funding to maintain the tool. Deputy Director Scott Robinson replied that more funding may come from the Nonhighway and Off-road Vehicle Activities (NOVA) account (which is funded by gasoline taxes) and perhaps from the Recreational Trails Program (RTP). He shared that the project is still in the planning phases.

Member Deller commented on the comprehensiveness of the database, noting that some common trails' data were not included. Mr. Jennings explained that the developers focused on available data, and as more funding is secured it will support adding data on local trails. Director Cottingham added that GIS point-to-point data needed to complete an accurate trail system is missing in some cases.

Member Willhite asked about further support or feedback that the board could provide in this effort. Mr. Jennings shared that outreach is important, but surveys are main form of feedback; staff also attend public meetings to further solicit feedback. Director Cottingham shared that feedback regarding water trails is especially positive.

Featured Project: Dan Haws, Outdoor Grants Manager, presented the East Tiger Mountain Trails System, the culmination of several mountain-bike trail development grants implemented on Department of Natural Resources lands in the Tiger Mountain State Forest. Funding from four separate RCO grants facilitated the construction which occurred from 2011 through 2015. The East Tiger Mountain Trail System draws nearly 60,000 user visits per year. Mr. Haws described the funding, development and completion of each trail segment. Future plans and grants expect another 6 miles to be added during 2016-17, which will result in 27.4 total trail miles.

Member Mayer shared his experience with the East Tiger Mountain Trails System and commended the work of DNR to value and create opportunities for mountain biking. Member Willhite echoed these sentiments, and added that it is crucial for generating tourism revenue.

Item 4: State Agency Partner Reports

Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR): Member Herman provided an update on behalf of DNR. He responded to Mr. Haws' presentation, the coalescence of funding, public support, and opportunity for the East Tiger Mountain Trails System was particularly serendipitous. He added that future plans include similar development near Snoqualmie.

Member Herman shared information about the record-breaking fire damage this year, noting that it will likely dominate the anticipated DNR-request legislation this coming session. DNR will be responding to the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) study, providing information and working with the Committee to supply the requested data. Regarding the gas tax passed last session, Mr. Herman shared that revenues are being depleted and DNR will be asking for more spending authority next session. Mr. Herman shared that Glen Glover joined the recreation team. Member Herman concluded by providing an update regarding DNR's efforts to improve recreation signage for improved user ease.

Member Willhite asked about continued fire suppression efforts. Member Herman explained that the upcoming Legislative session will include formal work sessions to identify challenges and lessons learned. Director Cottingham added that the Governor created a wildfire council to include advisors, which she has been invited to serve on to support these planning needs. Member Willhite noted that the fires are the result of climate change and predictions indicate worsening conditions; agencies need to maintain awareness of this issue to drive strategic planning.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW): Member Stohr provided an update on behalf of WDFW. He added to the discussion on fire recovery efforts, noting that about 90 miles of fencing was damaged or lost. The fencing keeps elks and other wildlife out of orchards and agricultural areas. Over 25,000 acres of habitat were lost, and WDFW will be submitting budget requests to address restoration needs. Member Stohr handed out information regarding recreational fishing benefits and the needed revenue influxes to support local economies. He shared several statistics covering commercial and private fishing; salmon cover a small portion, and the impacts to other fisheries and shellfish industries are often missed. He described the WDFW revenue sources and funding allocations, noting trends that follow salmon runs. The summary data rollup is available upon request.

General Public Comment: No general public comment was received.

Board Business: Decisions

Item 5: Youth Athletic Facilities Grant Awards

Kyle Guzlas, Outdoor Grants Manager, began his presentation with an overview of the Youth Athletic Facilities Program and the overall application metrics. New YAF policies were adopted by the board at their April 2015 meeting; RCO's subsequent YAF budget request was approved for \$10 million.

Applicants submitted 44 project proposals for funding consideration during this grant cycle. These requests total more than \$9 million, with nearly \$24 million in matching funds for a total project balance of \$33 million (no projects were eligible for a waived match). The Legislature appropriated about \$7 million in the 2015-2017 Capital Budget which will be available for this competitive YAF application cycle. Mr. Guzlas presented the top-ranked project, Mission Park Adaptive Ball Field Renovation, RCO #15-1434D, located in Spokane. In responding to board questions, Mr. Guzlas explained that ball parks are

more commonly being designed to support adaptive needs. For projects included as a direct appropriation, RCO will manage them similar to a normally awarded grant.

Member Mayer described an issue regarding crumb rubber's safety and health impacts, a popular synthetic material used in combination with sand on ball fields. He shared that nationally this is an issue of growing concern. He asked about the number of projects on list that use synthetic materials; Director Cottingham stated that about 40% of projects do. Member Mayer stated that Washington Department of Public Health is exploring this issue, noting growing concern in Snohomish County. He anticipates hearing more in the next legislative session; the Snohomish Health District, Member Mayer's employer, was asked to submit information and testimony regarding these issues. This may generate a broader discussion and he will share more with the board as the situation develops.

Member Willhite asked about the other projects that were not included on the ranked list and scoring. Mr. Guzlas shared that projects generally score well, but the category is new and in high demand, limiting project awards. Applicants are required to estimate use which is part of the evaluated and scored criteria. Mr. Guzlas added that larger facilities track this data, but smaller fields that don't typically charge for use are not as easily able to provide this data.

Public Comment:

Natalie Hanson, City of Long Beach Councilwoman, shared that support for the project application was unanimous and recommended approval of the project request.

Gayle Borcharo, City of Long Beach Community Development Director, offered her support of the project and shared that she was available to answer questions. She commended the work of RCO Grant Manager, Laura Moxham, and RCO Recreation and Conservation Section Manager, Marguerite Austin; she stated both were professional and helpful. Member Bloomfield asked about public process leading up to the project application submission. Ms. Borcharo responded that a hearing was held, but the public response was minimal. She noted that petition circulated with 20 people against the project, and over 200 in favor.

Elizabeth A. Bastsch, one of the petitioners in Exhibit A from Margie Seals' testimony (included in the meeting materials), asked that RCO Project #15-1432 be deferred until a new location can be found for regulation-sized field and the application data and estimated costs can be corrected. She shared several concerns regarding the project, including size, parking areas and restrictions, noise, foot/vehicle traffic, proximity of residential homes, alignment and drainage issues.

The board asked about current uses of the field, natural surface installation, alternative locations, community involvement, and the city's process for permitting. Ms. Bastsch replied that the field is currently used for both soccer and baseball. She added that the city council did not formally address the petitioners' concerns regarding available parking, noise, congestion, and safety.

Chair Spanel asked council members Gayle Borcharo and Natalie Hanson to address questions. Ms. Borcharo addressed parking design issues and safety precautions considered in the planning stages. Other park locations may exist, but lack sufficient access, are more expensive to develop, and are also surrounded by residential neighborhoods. Ms. Borcharo explained that the development process began when the City submitted the YAF Letter of Intent. At the time, funding was not available. Member Willhite confirmed that the City made their intentions known to the general public and solicited comment, held a public hearing, then received input after the hearing. The opposing petition was received well into the process, after almost two years of ongoing efforts.

Member Stohr asked whether the sponsor would need to start the application process over if another location was found. Director Cottingham explained that the sponsor would submit scope change, which would come to her for decision or the board, so they would not need to re-start the whole process.

Board Discussion:

Chair Spanel asked for a motion to approve Resolution 2015-21. Member Herman stated that there seems to be time to come to further consensus at the local level, and grant money may inflate the issues. It may be beneficial to delay the approval to allow the community to gather consensus.

Member Mayer thanked public for their testimony, and echoed Member Stohr's contracting obligation concerns, noting that locally this issue needs to be resolved prior to board decision. He added that there seems to be room to negotiate within project. Member Mayer moved to approve the resolution as proposed.

Member Bloomfield concurred that the judging local zoning and jurisdiction issues is beyond the board's scope, unless it's a defect with grant program development level. Member Willhite stated that receiving funding is key. Both agreed that there is room for local collaboration.

Resolution 2015-21

Moved by: Member Pete Mayer

Seconded by: Member Jed Herman

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 6: Land and Water Conservation Fund Legacy Program Awards

Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Conservation Section Manager, shared that the program has been delayed at the national level; the National Parks Service (NPS) has not published the federal funding opportunity notice because they are still discussing the new guidelines along with whether to combine the grant application cycles for federal fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

Director Cottingham added that RCO will try to incorporate a briefing into the next board meeting. With her ongoing delegation of authority she could move the process forward, but her hope is to bring the matter to the board once NPS releases the program notice. In an open public meeting, the board would then select and approve projects for submittal to the National Park Service for the national competition.

Member Bloomfield asked about the Bishop Bill that recently passed. Director Cottingham responded; she's been following the issue along with other NASORLO peers (National Association of State Outdoor Recreation Liaison Officers), but the outlook for funding is not hopeful.

Public Comment:

No public comment was provided at this time.

Resolution 2015-22 was withdrawn.

Break: 10:55 a.m. – 11:10 a.m.

Board Business: Briefings & Discussions

Item 7: Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group:

Wendy Brown, Policy Director, provided information about the legislative history of the Habitat and Recreation Lands Coordinating Group (Lands Group) and shared a list of the Lands Group's designated tasks, responsibilities, and potential duties.

Steve Hahn, Washington State Parks, and Clay Sprague, WDFW, both members of the Lands Group, shared information about the biennial funding and monitoring reports produced by the group. The reports describe the land acquisition efforts of WDFW, State Parks, and the Department of Natural Resources with the intent of providing more transparency and communication about each agency's respective processes. Both Mr. Hahn and Mr. Sprague shared that the Lands Group provides a needed place for agencies to share information and support strategic planning and acquisition.

Member Mayer asked how the board might support the Lands Group efforts further and pointed out that the board is required by statute to provide input on their request to the Legislature. Mr. Hahn commented the links between the groups and the board, noting that the reports are the documented evidence of how agencies are working and held accountable. The money that RCO awards for public land acquisition is part of these reports, providing a very clear tie between the two entities. Mr. Sprague added that the Lands Group could go a step further and relate the work to conservation efforts, seeing the board as an entity that could serve this role.

Member Stohr commented on the historical background of the Lands Group. Since 2007, many state agency processes have become more inclusive and land acquisition has evolved. He stated that the mission of the Lands Group should evolve to meet the current process. There is growing support and coalescence, and consideration of what the unified theory for lands acquisition should be to minimize silos and promote coherent actions.

Member Bloomfield suggested ways the board and the Lands Group could network and unify strategies, communicate about public lands, and share this information with constituents.

Member Herman commented on the policy implications. He shared that there are two perspectives on the work of the Lands Group, divided between being "done" with the work (land acquisitions) and those who seek to move the work forward.

Member Willhite responded to Mr. Hahn, noting the need to promote the efforts of the Lands Group more prominently. He asked whether the Lands Group incorporates larger recreation and conservation goals. Mr. Hahn responded that at this time there is a lack of staffing to support expanded efforts; Ms. Brown added that the outlook is hopeful, but they aren't ready at this time. The Lands Group is staffed by "volunteer time" and is not individually funded.

Member Mayer asked how the Land Group will evolve and how the priorities proposed for future work can be implemented, given finite resources and staffing.

Director Cottingham responded that support for the Lands Group and the Public Lands Inventory were examples used during 2015 to support the WWRP administrative rate increase. RCO has been told not to ask for general fund support for the Lands Group. RCO staff and partner agency staff continue making incremental progress.

Mr. Hahn shared that other boards and elected officials (State Parks Commission, Fish and Wildlife, Public Lands Commissioner) need to be involved in the planning and implementation of the future goals. Land acquisition is complex and support may need to be generated. Member Bloomfield suggested that higher education resources could support this work and add data. Chair Spanel suggested adding tribal representatives.

Member Mayer stated that some dialogue of board priorities and statement to support the group in fulfilling these priorities should be added to the Lands Groups' response to the Legislature. The board suggested clarification of the intent of the statute.

Chair Spanel stated that the role of the board is to provide guidance to the Lands Group regarding reauthorization. Ms. Brown added that the intent is to ensure that the reauthorization is supported by interested and participating parties so that it goes smoothly and there is consensus; it is not advisable, given the history provided by Director Cottingham, to include a budget request with this reauthorization request. Chair Spanel shared that the current RCO request bill is simply to extend the sunset date of the Lands Group.

Lunch 12:05 – 1:15 p.m.

Chair Spanel reported on the executive session, sharing that after consideration of the staff and board feedback, Director Cottingham received a positive review.

Item 8: Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee: Summary of Recent Reports and New Assignment Relating to Public Lands

Rebecca Connolly presented an overview of two public lands reports completed by the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) in 2015: the Economic Impact of Public Natural Resource Lands and the State Recreation and Habitat Lands reports.

In the State Recreation and Habitat Lands report, JLARC found that data were often spread across many reports and websites and weren't standardized. She shared the report recommendations, which included developing a single, easily accessible source for information on.

The second report, Economic Impact of Public Natural Resource Lands, focused on the economic vitality of counties. Findings showed that, in general, during the time period studied (1990-2010), public land was not detrimental to counties economic vitality. However, the report data showed that specific sites may have positive or negative net economic impacts dependent upon use (e.g., private rentals or vacation homes at a lake). She clarified the impacts that may not be identified or accounted for in this report, such as county-to-county influences.

Member Mayer asked to what extent the JLARC studies inform agency planning and actions. Member Herman responded that the reports are based upon legislative requests. Ms. Connolly clarified that the study's focus was on the impact to counties of public resource natural lands.

Board Business: Briefings & Discussions

Item 9: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Review Update

Wendy Brown, Policy Director, summarized the original budget proviso, established WWRP review process, and progress to date. The facilitators worked to identify values and concerns, from which the recommendations were developed. Ms. Brown described the key values identified and shared the draft review recommendations. Ms. Brown and Director Cottingham both spoke to the short timeframe and inability to reach full consensus given these limitations.

Member Deller asked about the anticipated reaction. Director Cottingham responded that she has not heard any official comment from the Legislature.

Member Willhite commented on the use of “urban” vs. “rural” as having or perpetuating negative dichotomies, suggesting using “underserved” instead. Director Cottingham acknowledged this concern, and Ms. Brown said she would review the statute and recommendations for alignment in this language.

Member Willhite asked if climate change would be addressed in the recommendations. Director Cottingham responded that there is reference to “change over time,” but it may not be explicit.

Member Mayer shared that Doug Levy’s memo recommended a different funding allocation than the proposed recommendation. He also expressed that the state acquisition and PILT issues are not as thoroughly addressed as may be necessary. He added that the board has the discretion to adjust funding allocations, as an example of what recommendations may be statutory versus policy changes.

Member Stohr addressed the issues shared by Member Mayer, highlighting additional values that could be added to the key values identified. He agreed with Member Mayer’s comments regarding more direction about PILT and board stewardship.

Director Cottingham shared that the concerns over land acquisition are not as large of an issue in the public eye as it is with state agencies and the Legislature; regardless, this survey response data will be included in the recommendations to the Legislature. She added that the survey helped to dispel many misunderstandings.

Member Herman commented on the inclusion of NGOs, stating that they must be held to the same standard as a state agency.

The board further discussed the need to enhance cooperation over competition; Member Bloomfield commented on current eligibility requirements, which send the opposite message. Her hope is that non-profit and agency partnerships will strengthen projects.

Item 10: Proposed Changes to the Grant Program Evaluation Criteria

Leslie Connelly and Adam Cole, Natural Resource Policy Specialists, provided a summary of the proposed changes to evaluation criteria for multiple grant programs for the 2016 grant cycle. Staff requested direction from the board on the proposed recommendations and changes prior to the public comment period. Ms. Connelly and Mr. Cole presented the changes for each program. Chair Spanel recommended that the board provide direction after each item. The supporting documentation is included in the board materials, Item 10, Attachments A-F.

Boating Facility Program Changes (Attachment A)

Preference for Boats on Trailers

Staff requested direction on continuing to serve all types of boating facilities without preference or returning a preference for boats on trailers. Member Stohr asked why the original preference was removed. Ms. Connelly shared that the advisory committee recommended removal due to questions of equity in cost. Member Willhite stated in terms of equity, it seems to cater to larger boats. Mr. Cole shared that the biggest need is for trailered boats, as reported by the boating advisory committee.

Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship

Staff requested direction regarding the inclusion of an evaluation question in the criteria as a stand-alone question with custom guidances by project type. The board discussed the recommendation, and agreed with the staff recommendation going out for public comment.

Nonhighway Off-Road Vehicle Activities Category Criteria Changes (Attachment B)

Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship

Staff requested direction regarding the inclusion of an evaluation question in the criteria as a stand-alone question with custom guidances by project type. This will not apply to the Education and Enforcement Category. The board agreed with the staff recommendation for public comment.

Combination Acquisition and Development Projects

Staff requested direction regarding clarification of the pathway to score a Combination Acquisition and Development projects. Staff recommended that these projects be scored as a separate project type and total point values would remain unchanged across project types. The board discussed the maximum points awarded; staff acknowledged that there are some discrepancies with the manual and the points presented.

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, Trails Category Criteria Changes (Attachment C)

Staff requested direction regarding the "Trails and Community Linkages", "Water Access, Views, and Scenic Access", and "Wildlife Habitat Connectivity" questions, as well as revised guidances to the design question.

Community Linkages

The board discussed the term "different groups of people", how it is defined and the purpose of the inclusion. Member Mayer and Member Bloomfield felt that this value is somewhat ambiguous and potentially belongs under a different question, or could be removed until it is further defined. Member Herman suggested submitting the question as it is written for public comment and allow them to make recommendations; the board agreed with this approach.

Project Design

Staff proposed an update to include a requirement that project designs are accessible to the greatest extent possible, given the context and purpose of the trail. The board agreed with the staff recommendation for public comment.

Water Access and Scenic Views

Staff requested direction on the division of the water access and scenic view criteria and resulting point adjustments. The board discussed the merits of separating the criteria and assigned point values. Staff explained their interpretation of the terms "views", "values", and "water access" in statute as it applied to their recommendation; all acknowledged some degree of subjectivity that confuses the criteria. Potential solutions involved putting "water access" under "scenic values", as some projects do not involve water at all (which creates a disadvantage). Staff will revise the language based on the board discussion prior to public comment.

Enhancement of Wildlife Habitat

Staff requested direction on the change from wildlife habitat connectivity to enhancement beyond what may be required by permit or regulation. The board agreed with the staff recommendation for public comment.

Trails Separated by Roadway

Ms. Connelly advised WWRP Manual 10a describes the trails criteria must be "separated by physical barriers." This issue then causes diversity of separations which staff must evaluate on a case-by-case basis. The board agreed with the staff recommendation for public comment.

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (Attachment D)

The program had major revisions in 2008 and does not score both elements of combination projects. Ms. Connelly requested direction on adjusting the scoring for question 4. The board agreed with the staff recommendation for public comment.

Cost Efficiencies (Attachment E)

Staff requested direction on cost efficiencies, potentially removing the bonus point. The board agreed with the staff recommendation for public comment.

New SCORP Criteria (Attachment F)

Staff requested direction on adding a new evaluation question that will address SCORP priorities.

The board discussed general agreement with the staff recommendation (option 2). Member Bloomfield commented on the burden on applicants of knowing and understanding the SCORP; while it is necessary, can staff narrow or craft specific guidelines to support ease in the application process? Staff agreed, noting that the staff support would come in the form of guidances which is an established process with which applicants are familiar.

WWRP Critical Habitat (Attachment G)

Staff requested direction on revision and simplification of the evaluation criteria.

Member Bloomfield commented on the scientific basis of the criteria, intended to protect priority species and habitat. She recommended an option that does not target one type of sponsor as a way to narrow the criteria, as it would detract from the intended benefit.

Member Mayer asked for clarification of the criteria for "Public Enjoyment." Ms. Connelly explained that the intent to include it comes from the definition of Critical Habitat. She acknowledged that more guidance could be provided; Chair Spanel added that the intent for public enjoyment is based on opportunity. Director Cottingham proposed a rephrase of the term to be "an opportunity for public use." Member Mayer and the board agreed.

Member Bloomfield stated that it may not be necessary to refine this criteria until the WWRP review is complete, adding concerns regarding time efficiencies. Member Bloomfield recommended focusing on non-WWRP categories. Ms. Connelly responded that the intent is to determine what can be done now, knowing that there may be changes resulting from the coming review. Director Cottingham responded that some groups approached RCO over two years ago, and could be seen as proactive on behalf of the board. Chair Spanel noted that the legislative actions are yet unknown, and it may still be fruitful to continue with the revisions as planned.

The board discussed the options, noting that there is need to remove duplication of efforts, and that the category supports the need for the scientific elements and the criteria should not be simplified at the expense of these priorities. The board agreed with option 2 of the staff recommendation for public comment.

Ms. Connelly concluded by sharing that the board direction will be used to prepare for public comment, scheduled for December 7 through December 31, allowing for a later presentation at the February 2016 meeting.

Item 11: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Farmland Preservation Evaluation Criteria and Policies

Ms. Connelly summarized the actions to date and noted that today's decision marks the culmination of three years of work. She provided a summary of the public comment received and the resulting revisions to the draft policies and criteria.

The board discussed the proposed changes (revised after public comment) as outlined in Item 11, Attachments B and C, of the meeting materials.

Member Mayer asked for clarification on the riparian buffer discussion. Ms. Connelly responded that the Swinomish Tribe was encouraging a minimum buffer requirement. Staff responded by adding language under the "Stewardship" question and under "Community Support." Member Mayer asked about examples of public access, specifically gates or stiles for access. Director Cottingham suggested adding "hiking" to the examples of public access, considering the property owner preferences. After further discussion, the board agreed to add the language "may include walking..." to the criteria.

The board discussed the complications of public access and property rights, based on agreement terms, including what constitutes public benefit. There remain concerns regarding easements and fee simple properties. Ms. Connelly reminded the board that the policy is new and primarily meant to eliminate grant program conflicts. Staff believes the revised policy, based on public comment, addresses concerns of both.

Member Herman suggested amending the language to include reference of the landowner. The board discussed this suggestion; a potential suggestion included changing "are" to "may" to allow flexibility. Member Bloomfield asked about the criteria for threat to the land should it not be protected, suggesting a timeframe or limitation to allow for more precise scoring. The board suggested two years; Director Cottingham stated five years is reasonable, ten years is too long. The board discussed the criteria for farmland conservation values.

Chair Spanel requested a motion from the board based on the discussion. The amendments included adding language to the public access within a Farmland Conservation easement to include "may include walking" (subsection 2 of Attachment C), and adding language to the Threat to Land criteria by adding a timeframe "within the next five years" (subsection D of Attachment B). The resolution was amended to state that the Attachments A and B are approved as amended.

Resolution 2015-23, as amended

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Peter Mayer

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 12: Changes to the Grant Programs for 2015-17

Ms. Connelly provided a summary of public comment feedback received on three policy changes: control and tenure, additional scope change policy for WWRP, and multi-site development for trails and water trails categories.

Control and Tenure

Staff suggested postponing a decision on this policy change. The board agreed not to take action at this time, as the policy needs further development.

Additional scope changes policy for WWRP

Member Mayer agreed with informing the local jurisdiction, raising questions about the process for consulting with the Legislature. The board discussed the application process for sponsors and implications of the approval process for projects, focusing on the ranked lists approved by the Legislature. There was some agreement that notifying or requesting subsequent approval from the Legislature of scope changes is necessary. The board wished to have further discussion on this topic and tabled the item until February.

Multi-site Development for Trails and Water Trails

The board did not discuss this policy change.

The board discussed amendments to Resolution 2015-24 to exclude the paragraph/reference on scope changes in Attachment B. The board also discussed the need to develop mechanisms for boosting public comment responses, which may involve requesting review from advisory committees.

Resolution 2015-24, as amended

Moved by: Member Ted Willhite

Seconded by: Member Mike Deller

Resolution: APPROVED

Closing: Day One

The meeting was adjourned for the day at 5:42 p.m. by Chairwoman Chair Spanel.

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION FUNDING BOARD SUMMARY MINUTES

Date: November 19, 2015

Place: Olympia, WA

Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Members:

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

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 9:05 a.m. Staff called roll and a quorum was determined. Member Herzog was excused.

Item 14: Revising the Board's Strategic Plan and Performance Measures: Continued Board Member Discussion

**Presented out of order.*

Scott Robinson, Deputy Director, provided a summary of the board's actions in 2015 regarding updates to their strategic plan and performance measures. He reminded the board of several action items from the retreat for the board's consideration.

Member Deller stated that he approves of the current measures. His focus is on whether the performance measures capture the data necessary to gauging success.

Member Willhite noted the division between the eastern and western areas of the state, and suggested a division of urban versus rural to move away from the adverse dichotomy of state division. He suggested using a population-based approach to divide funds as a way to reach this metric. He volunteered himself to serve on a subcommittee to support this effort.

Member Bloomfield suggested adding a question for assembling and collecting data from published reports to help frame their impact. She specified that the goal is not to create new data, but to use existing information to reframe the questions in a way that will measure progress. Member Bloomfield discussed some of the discrepancies between the performance measures and the data collected, e.g., survey responses, public comments received, etc.

Director Cottingham expressed concerns about having adequate staff and funding to support an extensive effort to collect and report the boards performance measures. Chair Spanel agreed that there needs to be a rationale for collecting existing data and relating it to an outcome.

Member Willhite suggested duplicating the data outcomes that came from the RCO Outdoor Economic Study, and reporting these metrics on a regular basis. He also advocated for a metric that captures high-level or broad vision data, highlighting the example of data from the economic report describing forests as a carbon sink.

Chair Spanel responded to the population-based approach, sharing examples of users travelling to recreate. This alters revenue sources that cannot be tracked to a population base of the local area. Member Willhite suggested a mix-model approach that draws upon existing data from a number of silos.

Member Mayer stated the need for a measure of the board's success in meeting goals, which goes beyond simple survey response data and grant funding approvals. He explained the need to understand how board activities contribute to actions such as protecting critical habitat, improving recreation, conserving landscapes and species, etc. He suggested using grant data, park use data, SCORP data, and/or existing models to gauge this progress.

Member Deller agreed with Member Mayer's goal of measuring the effectiveness of the board. He expressed sympathy to limited staff resources, but also the need for strong data to support advocacy in the Legislature, among other venues. He acknowledged that the process will be slow, suggesting a simple beginning of reviewing the three main goals and determining if they need to be reframed.

Member Herman responded to the suggestion to reframe goals by suggesting example metrics to track, e.g., proximity to recreation areas, square mileage in trails systems. Data can be sourced from existing members' respective organizations. Member Stohr cautioned the collection or use of limited data variables (e.g., simple acreage metrics). He suggested focusing on data that is representative of a larger sample and can speak to the larger issues across the state. Member Bloomfield explained the need to embed data in a larger framework for context, using partners' data, to reach overarching goals and see impacts of work in the state.

Member Mayer referred to the statute of the board to provide context of how a reframe of the goals/questions, asking that staff return at the February 2016 meeting with recommendations. Existing information can inform how the board achieves reframing their metrics in a meaningful way.

Member Bloomfield agreed the goals are appropriate, but there is room to improve the framing questions. She suggested a longer, more in-depth conversation to focus on these questions. Member Willhite agreed with Member Bloomfield on the goals and framing questions needing revision. He asked for specific suggestion prior to the next meeting, having them ready to discuss and consider adopting at that time. He suggested gathering data or metrics from partners to inform the board's measures.

Director Cottingham suggested bringing in presenters from organizations who are tracking data that is used to advocate for projects and tell local stories. Member Mayer provided examples of how to take agency data, apply it to the decisions made by the board and determine aggregate outcomes. This process, or one similar, will help identify trends and inform policy decisions, without needing to be duplicative with other agency efforts.

Member Deller suggested next steps, by agreeing to the goals, identifying questions or measures that need revision that staff can work on and bring to the next meeting.

Member Willhite asked whether a motion would be appropriate to approve the strategic plan as it stands, on the condition that the statutory partners provide their existing metrics for potential inclusion in their plan's measures. Member Bloomfield suggested adding time for reporting this information in the partner reports, to limit the data shared to board-related measures.

Chair Spanel responded to the board discussion, explaining that the authority of the board is limited in some regard, not only by funding or staff resources, but by statute. Deputy Robinson suggested an iterative process with the grant program criteria that will determine metrics and measures.

Member Stohr suggesting using introductory paragraphs about where related data is already tracked, in part to minimize duplication and in part to inform others of a larger state system. Member Bloomfield and Member Mayer support a bottom-up metric that can demonstrate the board's progress and effectiveness.

Item 13: Communications Plan Update

**Presented out of order*

Susan Zemek, Communications Manager, provided an update of the communication plan activities that have occurred in the first two years of RCO's 5-year communication plan. She presented data that speak to the three main goals of the plan, the strategies that support these goals, supportive data to demonstrate progress over the past two years, and actions for future implementation.

Member Willhite asked about RCO media outreach, including Facebook and other social media requirements. Ms. Zemek explained that social media communications are published as appropriate, but noted that county, city, or other local websites are typically out of date.

Deputy Robinson responded that grant managers work with sponsors to promote ribbon cutting celebrations, which the Director attends when she is available. Member Deller responded to a proposal to participate in public outreach by attending events and representing the board. Member Mayer added that board members could play a more active role as ambassadors across the state.

Member Mayer asked which data are tracked by RCO's metric media references. Ms. Zemek shared that she tracks RCO's news releases and the number of times other entities highlight RCO's work. Member Mayer asked for clarification on how the board's key messages are shared as compared to the WWRC, and that Ms. Zemek return to provide information on key messages for the board.

Member Bloomfield commended Ms. Zemek for her work in demonstrating trends and tracking progress over time as it relates to the goals of the communication plan.

Deputy Robinson provided information on the issue of the "News Clips" tracked by Ms. Zemek and shared with the board, staff, and the public. He stated that the time spent reading or using this information is significantly inverse to the time it takes to prepare. He proposed an alternate model that formats these news items in a way that minimizes staff time and maximizes use. Staff time would be reduced if the board members were sent the same formatted information that is sent to staff, on a similar frequency. The board appreciated the proposal and generally agreed that staff should move forward.

Break: 10:50 – 11:05 a.m.

Item 15: Recreation and Conservation Planning Next Steps

Ms. Connelly presented information regarding the development of a work plan and budget for a unifying strategy on recreation needs and the next Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). She explained the components that supported development of the proposed plan, as well as examples that could help the board and agency respond to the National Park Service by December 2017, as required by SCORP: 1) establishment of a planning advisory committee; 2) defining the scope of the unifying strategy; and 3) identifying data needs and how to implement or incorporate supplemental data.

Ms. Connelly described potential report formats, necessary budget expenses and potential sources, and a timeline for implementing this work. The SCORP must be updated every five years. Ms. Connelly requested direction from the board on the proposed workplan and timeline, with the goal of allowing adequate time for the development of the process, review, and approval.

Member Willhite supported the plan as presented and offered to volunteer on the planning committee.

Member Mayer agreed with the proposal for simplistic report design and supplement detail. He expressed appreciation for using examples of other states' models to develop a clear, thorough plan. Also, he believes that it encompasses the best elements of SCORP models and targets what the board would hope to see with this plan. He suggested adding an element to projects that addresses the relationship to the SCORP.

Member Stohr asked about the potential response based on the size of the plan, referring to the "digestible" aspect of sharing information. Ms. Connelly stated that she expects that a simpler document would receive more feedback. She hoped to narrow the board's direction to the plan's appropriateness and included metrics, and whether they felt it was headed in the right direction.

Next steps include completing a project charter and scope of work (mainly for staff), an advisory committee charter, advisory committee recruitment, and ultimately drafting a unifying strategy in a SCORP-like document. The board materials (Item 15) state that April 2016 is the kick-off for the advisory committee, therefore staff will use time during the winter to prepare the charters and work plan. Ms. Connelly is currently working on combining state agency surveys in order to de-duplicate and compile the necessary data. She intends to use other states' SCORP survey questions to design core questions for Washington State; this will allow comparable results over future years.

Item 16: Scoping of Climate Change Policy

Meg O'Leary, Policy Administrator, summarized the results of the climate change criteria scoping effort requested by board members. She provided examples of different approaches taken by other state and federal agencies. The national and local models are often very generalized or high-level, making it difficult to localize at the watershed level. She recommended a tool (outlined in the board materials) that would help with local variables and planning to meet the board-level needs.

Ms. O'Leary requested direction from the board regarding redefining the program statement and goals for incorporating climate change into the board programs, choosing an approach and associated timeline, and how to consider and incorporate public comment. She outlined four scenarios for the board to begin discussing options.

Member Deller supported a hybrid of the RCO staff lead with advisement from supporting entities. Member Willhite advocated for an approach that addresses criteria at the applicant level, where grant applications must identify project elements that will support climate change policies. Member Stohr requested to be involved, whether on a subcommittee or in another supportive capacity.

Member Bloomfield stated that in current criteria, the applicant must identify an associated governing plan and could identify a related climate change model that provides guidance or speaks to adaption outcomes. This would support measuring existing criteria without having to create new criteria for each program. She supported moving forward with the RCO staff lead option.

Ms. Austin added to the discussion by describing a potential sustainability pilot and suggested criteria that would be used. She explained that, in previous efforts, the process started small, with simple

questions, to see how applicants would respond. From this information, staff developed the current criteria.

Member Willhite believed the first three scenarios presented to be beneficial, but likely lacking resources to support them. Director Cottingham suggested modeling the sustainability criteria process by beginning with open-ended questions in a few categories.

Member Herman shared information about the efforts of a committee he served on that looked at climate change risk as it applies to species or project locations. He put this example forth as a way to provide a framework for applicants that drives consideration of climate change and potential connections, not forced outcomes.

The board generally agreed to begin with Critical Habitat to test questions that address climate change, focusing on adaption for the next grant round, similar to how the sustainability questions were piloted and developed. Chair Spanel suggested using the RCO staff lead option, with the support of Members Willhite and Stohr.

Member Bloomfield clarified the discussion of board members, asking that the initial step is to begin with acknowledging that the board is addressing climate change, and next steps include scale and metrics. Chair Spanel and Member Willhite confirmed.

Lunch 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

Item 17A: Overview of Conversion and Allowable Use Policies

Myra Barker, Compliance Specialist, provided a brief overview of the compliance pathways for conversions and allowable use. She summarized the board's authority and responsibilities for conversions and a summary of the allowable use policies.

Item 17B: Vancouver Water Works Park (RCO #84-9015D)

Ms. Barker presented information about the request from the City of Vancouver regarding the conversion of 7.5 acres at Waterworks Park, as outlined in the board materials.

Board Discussion

Member Mayer asked how the conversion property's placement would affect the adjacent Clark County College facilities. Monica Tubberville, City of Vancouver Park Planner, came forward to respond, addressing questions regarding a day care on the property. Member Willhite asked about the location of Shaffer Park (the replacement property). Ms. Barker responded that the City requested a waiver of retroactivity, a common process in similar cases.

Public Comment

No public comment provided. Monica Tubberville, City of Vancouver Park Planner, submitted a comment form to make herself available for board questions.

Resolution 2015-25

Moved by: Member Jed Herman

Seconded by: Member Ted Willhite

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 17C: Mountlake Terrace Jack Long Park (RCO #68-096A, #68-099D)

Ms. Barker summarized a request from the City of Mountlake Terrace, asking the board to approve the conversion of 0.54 acres at Jack Long Park, as outlined in the board materials.

Board Discussion

Member Mayer asked information about equivalent usefulness, remarking on the steepness of the slope and invasive species. Ms. Barker explained the awkwardness of the current tower location, which is driving the need for a conversion. Member Mayer asked about other impeding elements of the surrounding equipment.

Member Willhite asked about the public involvement in this process and the inspections that have taken place. Ms. Barker explained that the water district deeded the property to the city, and it was also determined that to make use of the place a park could be included. There seem to have been misunderstanding or lack of information about the requirements of the property or how it should be used compliant with the agreement terms. Member Willhite suggested some form of inspection process, perhaps self-inspection to support the process; he referred to the board's performance measures regarding sites not ever inspected. Ms. Barker explained how the agency currently handles inspections and related processes.

Member Deller requested that staff prepare or provide maps that are clearer and easier to discern ground-level images.

Public Comment

No public comment provided at this time. Jeff Betz, City of Mountlake Terrace Recreation and Parks Director, submitted a comment form to make himself available for board questions.

Resolution 2015-26

Moved by: Member Mike Deller

Seconded by: Member Pete Mayer

Resolution: APPROVED

Item 17D: Clark County Lewis River Greenway (RCO #96-074A)

Myra Barker, Compliance Specialist, began by briefly summarizes the board's authorities in the case of conversions. She then summarized a request Clark County, asking the board to approve the conversion of 20 acres within the Lewis River Greenway. She requested board comments and questions, noting that a final decision will come to the board at the February 2016 meeting.

Chair Spanel reminded the board of correspondence received regarding this project.

Public Comment

Patrick Lee, Clark County Program Coordinator, came forth to respond to board questions. Member Mayer asked about the relation to Conservation Futures; Mr. Lee responded that proceeds from sale of Conservation Futures properties are returned to that account.

Mr. Lee shared that the City evaluated replacement property options; challenges exist on some alternatives due to existing structures and Land and Water Conservation Fund requirements.

Member Mayer asked about the parcel acquisition timeline. Mr. Lee shared that the process has taken several decades. Concerns over loss of open spaces within the City led to development of the Greenway. Conservation Futures was developed in tandem with this effort.

Chair Spanel referred to the "Friends of Clark County" regarding the lack of replacement property. Mr. Lee responded that they are still assessing appropriate replacement sites.

Member Willhite thanked Mr. Lee for approaching the board early in the process. Mr. Lee responded that the public process was initiated upfront, with county officials reviewing park uses, board work sessions, and board hearings. Mr. Lee conducted an alternative analysis, similar to the information provided to RCO. He stated that he is seeking guidance on whether to pursue the conversion or not, and if so, begin looking at replacement properties.

Member Mayer asked about the motivation for the conversion. He shared that the issue has been controversial locally. Member Deller asked about board policy that may preclude conditions mentioned by Member Mayer. He expressed support of the conversion, noting the expanded trail system. Once the County determines a replacement property, and willing sellers, the conversion request would be open to public comment then come to the board for decision.

Member Willhite supported the neutrality of the board in this case, until a property is selected and the public comment period completed. He stated that the role of the board includes ensuring that the proper processes are followed. Mr. Lee hopes to receive guidance from public comment that will be solicited, including identification of a potential replacement property. He shared a few alternative parcel options, referring the board to the location map, noting pros and cons.

Item 17E: City of Spokane Riverfront Park Combined Sewer Overflow (RCO #72-040)

Kyle Guzlas, Outdoor Grants Manager, summarized a request from the City of Spokane, asking the board to approve the installation of a CSO located under a parcel that was acquired with project #72-040. Mr. Guzlas explained that the request is currently under consideration of the director, who may choose to move the request to the board for decision. The board is being briefed on this request now because this action, if approved, will result in a temporary recreational closure that exceeds the 180-day maximum limit as defined in policy. A board decision would be necessary to extend the temporary recreational closure beyond the 180-day threshold.

Board Discussion

Member Deller asked about parking options. Mr. Guzlas explained the plans for parking and signage. Member Mayer asked about current and historic parking use. Mr. Guzlas explained that it is primarily public parking use and some city employee parking use; historically, this lot has changed several times and the intended use has not always been clear.

Ms. Barker explained options and staff's role in providing guidance in partial conversions. Chair Spanel commented that the proposal serves project needs, allowing parking for the park and trail system use.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:24 p.m. by Chairwoman Chair Spanel. The next meeting is scheduled for February 9-10, 2016 at the Lacey Community College.

Approved by:



Theodore Willhite, Vice Chair



Date

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution #2015-20
November 18-19, 2015 Consent Calendar**

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following November 18-19, 2015 Consent Calendar items are approved:

- A. Volunteer Recognition for Advisory Committees

Resolution moved by: Ted Willhite

Resolution seconded by: Betsy Bloomfield

Adopted Date: November 18, 2015

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2015-23
Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
Farmland Preservation Evaluation Criteria and Policies**

WHEREAS, pursuant to RCW 79A.15.130, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) administers and approves policies that govern the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Farmland Preservation Account and sets evaluation criteria for grant applications, and

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), with board direction, completed a two-year review of the grant program in 2014 which resulted in a number of recommendation on how to improve the program, and

WHEREAS, the RCO prepared draft policies and evaluation criteria and solicited for comments from the Farmland Advisory Committee and over 2,700 members of the public, and staff adjusted the policies and evaluation criteria as appropriate and recommends the board approve the final draft materials as presented in Attachments B and C, and

WHEREAS, the changes are consistent with state law, the board’s administrative rules, the recommendations in the program review, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board adopts the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program Farmland Protection Account policies and evaluation criteria as depicted in Attachments B as amended and C as amended, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board directs RCO staff to incorporate these changes in the appropriate policy manuals with language that reflects the policy intent; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these policies shall be effective beginning with the 2016 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Ted Willhite

Resolution seconded by: Pete Mayer

Adopted Date: November 18, 2015

Proposed Changes to Policies in the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account

A. Definition of Farmland

CURRENT POLICY:

Farmland is interpreted as “farm and agricultural land” and is defined in Appendix A. [Appendix A is the text from the Open Space Tax Act.]

PROPOSED REVISED POLICY: PARCELS ELIGIBLE IN THE WWRP FARMLAND PRESERVATION ACCOUNT

This policy applies to each parcel included in a grant application to the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account.

1. State Law Defines “Farmland” in WWRP¹ the Same as “Farm and Agricultural Land” in the Open Space Tax Act²

The director will ensure each parcel protected with funds from the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account meets the definition of farm and agricultural land in the Open Space Tax Act. ~~Parcels must continue to meet the definition of farm and agricultural land for the life of the conservation easement.~~

2. ~~Each Parcel in a Grant Application Must Be Classified or Eligible for Classification as Farm and Agricultural Land in the Open Space Tax Act~~ Applicants Must Provide Documentation that Parcels Meet Eligibility Requirements

Applicants must provide documentation that each parcel in a grant application is classified as farm and agricultural land in the Open Space Tax Act. Acceptable forms of documentation are a ~~letter or other~~ written document from the county assessor, a current property tax notice, or a recent title report, ~~which that~~ shows the classification as an encumbrance on the property. The director relies on documentation provided by the applicant to make a determination of eligibility.

If a parcel is not classified as farm and agricultural land, an applicant may seek an informal or preliminary determination from the county assessor ~~where the parcel is located as to whether that~~ the parcel could be classified as farm and agricultural land in the Open Space Tax Act. Acceptable documentation ~~of an informal or preliminary determination is are~~ a letter from the county assessor or the county assessor’s approval of an application for farm and agricultural land classification.

The property owner is not required to participate in the Open Space Tax Act. However, meeting the definition of farm and agricultural land is required for the life of the conservation easement as stated in section ~~1-3~~ of this policy.

3. ~~Open Space Tax Classification as Farm and Agricultural Land~~ Eligibility is Determined at the Application Due Date

¹ RCW 79A.15.010(4)

² RCW 84.34.020(2)

To be eligible for grant funding, the applicant must demonstrate that each parcel in the grant application meets the definition of farm and agricultural land in the Open Space Tax Act by the application due date. The director may extend the deadline up until the date of the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board meeting when it approves the ranked list of projects. Parcels must continue to meet the definition of farm and agricultural land for the life of the conservation easement.

B. Project Scope May Include One or More Parcels

NEW POLICY: APPLICATIONS MAY INCLUDE ONE OR MORE PARCELS IN THE WWRP FARMLAND PRESERVATION ACCOUNT

This policy applies to each grant application to the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account.

1. All Parcels Proposed for Acquisition Must be Identified in the Grant Application

The director will ensure each application identifies all parcels proposed for acquisition by the technical completion deadline.

2. Each Parcel Must be Identified by a Map and a County Parcel Number

Each application must include a map that identifies each parcel in the application and the parcel's identification number.

3. All Parcels Must Be Contiguous or ~~Owned by the Same Landowner~~ Within the Same Ownership

~~If there is more than one parcel in an application, the parcels must be:~~

- ~~• Contiguous, if the parcels are owned by different property owners, or~~
- ~~• Contiguous or non-contiguous, if the parcels are owned by a family group of property owners.~~

If there is more than one parcel in an application, the parcels must be either owned by the same ownership as defined in RCW 84.34.020(6)(b)(i) and (ii) or contiguous to each other.

4. Definition of Property Owner ~~and Family Group~~

For purposes of this policy, property owner means the individual, individuals, or business(es) that holds title to a parcel of land. ~~Property owners who are immediate family members or operate a family farm under the same licensed business are considered a family group of property owners. Immediate family members are grandparents, parents, spouses, in-laws, aunts, uncles, cousins, siblings, and children, including adopted, half and step family members.~~

5. Definition of Contiguous

For purposes of this policy, contiguous means two or more parcels ~~which that~~ physically touch one another along a boundary or a point. Land divided by a public road, but otherwise an integral part of a farming operation, is considered contiguous.

C. Limits on the Amount of Impervious Surface

CURRENT POLICY:

For the purpose of the agricultural conservation easement, “impervious surfaces” means all hard surface areas that either prevent or retard water runoff and absorption. Impervious surfaces have the effect of removing soil from cultivation. Because the goal of this program is to preserve the opportunity for agriculture, impervious surfaces limits will be based on a sliding scale related to farm size.

Farm Size	Amount of Impervious Surfaces Allowed
50 acres	6 percent+
51-100 acres	6 percent
101-200 acres	5 percent
201-500 acres	4 percent
501-1,000 acres	3 percent
1,001+ acres	2 percent

This sliding scale is a general guideline, with adjustments made on a case-by-case basis.

If the federal Agricultural Conservation Easement Program is a funding partner, the limit is 2 percent. The 2 percent maximum may be waived by the easement program’s state conservationist on a case-by-case basis.

PROPOSED REVISED POLICY: THE AMOUNT OF IMPERVIOUS SURFACE WITHIN THE FARMLAND CONSERVATION EASEMENT AREA IS LIMITED

This policy applies to each farmland conservation easement in the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account.

1. Definition of Impervious Surface

Impervious surface is defined as all hard surface areas that either prevent or retard water absorption into the soil and have the effect of removing soil from cultivation.

2. Impervious Surface Limits are Based on Farm Size

The maximum percent land within the farmland conservation easement area allowed to be impervious surface is:

Size of the Easement Area	Percent of Land Allowed to be Impervious Surface
50 acres or less	6 percent or more
51-100 acres	6 percent
101-200 acres	5 percent

Size of the Easement Area	Percent of Land Allowed to be Impervious Surface
201-500 acres	4 percent
501-1,000 acres	3 percent
1,001+ acres	2 percent

EXCEPTION: When the Natural Resources Conservation Service provides matching funds to a WWRP Farmland Preservation Account easement, the director may use the definition of impervious surface used by the Natural Resources Conservation Service as long as it does not exceed the maximum amount as described in the table above.

EXCEPTION: The director may approve a higher percentage of land as impervious surface on an individual project basis.

D. Public Access Within a Farmland Conservation Easement

PROPOSED NEW POLICY: PUBLIC ACCESS WITHIN A FARMLAND CONSERVATION EASEMENT

This policy applies to each farmland conservation easement in the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account.

1. No Right of Access by the Public Unless Explicitly Included as a Permitted Use

~~Per~~By state law, the acquisition of property does not provide a right of access to the property unless it is ~~explicitly~~ stated explicitly as a permitted use in the farmland conservation easement.³

If a property owner, or future property owner, of the farmland conservation easement and the sponsor agrees to allow public access ~~with~~in the conservation easement area, such use shall be identified as a permitted use and included in the farmland conservation easement or amended into the easement at a later date. Examples of public access ~~are~~ may include walking, public trails, water access sites, and areas for wildlife viewing, ~~and~~ hunting, and fishing.

2. Public Access is a Benefit to the Community

~~Per~~By state law, acquisition priorities for the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account shall consider whether a farmland conservation easement is consistent with a regional or statewide recreation plan.⁴ Evaluators shall ~~give preference for~~ give consideration applications that are consistent with such plans when scoring ~~the appropriate~~ the other benefits in the Community Values evaluation question.

E. Amendments to the Project Scope Must be Reviewed by the Advisory Committee (new)

³ RCW 79A.15.130(5)

⁴ RCW 79A.15.130(9(d))

PROPOSED NEW POLICY: THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEWS ALL REQUESTS TO CHANGE A PARCEL IN A WWRP FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROJECT

This policy applies to projects funded in the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account during the project agreement period of performance when a sponsor requests to add or remove parcels from the project agreement.

1. The Director Consults with the WWRP Farmland Advisory Committee on all Requests to Change a Parcel

The director will consult with the WWRP Farmland Advisory Committee on any request to change a parcel in a project funded in the Farmland Preservation Account. A parcel change includes requests to remove parcels or add new parcels to the scope of a project.

2. WWRP Farmland Advisory Committee Provides a Recommendation to the Director on all Requests to Change a Parcel

The WWRP Farmland Advisory Committee reviews any request to add or remove a parcel to determine whether the change would result in similar farmland conservation values as those presented in the application. The committee will recommend to the director that the change provides less, more or similar farmland conservation values when compared with the parcel(s) presented in the application. ~~The Committee provides one of the following recommendations to the director:~~

- ~~• The change provides less farmland conservation value compared to the parcel(s) presented in the application, or~~
- ~~• The change provides similar farmland conservation values as the parcel(s) presented in the application, or~~
- ~~• The change provides more farmland conservation values compared to the parcel(s) presented in the application.~~

3. Requests to Change a Parcel Must Comply with the Scope Change Policy

Any request to change a parcel in a project funded from the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account must comply with the board's policy on scope changes as described in *Manual 3, Acquisition Projects*.

Proposed Evaluation Criteria in the WWRP Farmland Preservation Account

1. Viability of the Site

What is the viability of the site for agricultural production?⁵ Viability of the site includes:

- Soil types,
- Suitability for producing different types or varieties of crops, ~~and~~
- Water availability.

Score 0 - 16 points based on the viability of the site for agricultural production.

When considering the viability of the site as cropland and pastureland, consider whether the site has suitable soils and enough water ~~availability~~ to produce a variety of crops. Applicants should provide information about the types of crops that could be grown on the site now and in the future and the potential bushel yield.

When considering the viability of the site as rangeland, consider whether the site has suitable soils and enough water ~~availability~~ to produce stock. Applicants should provide a specific number of animals that the land could produce such as "animal management units" (AMUs) or the "carrying capacity".

2. Threat to the Land

What is the likelihood the land will not stay in ~~an~~ agricultural use if it is not protected?⁶

Score the question based on the severity of the threat that the property will be converted to some use other than agriculture within the next five years.

- Low likelihood it will ~~not stay in agricultural~~ be converted to another use (0 point)
- Medium likelihood it will ~~not stay in agricultural~~ be converted to another use (1 – 5 points)
- High likelihood it will ~~not stay in agricultural~~ be converted to another use (6 – 10 points)

3. Access to Markets

How is the land's agricultural productivity supported by access to markets?⁷

Available markets may include formal private markets, commodity exchanges and auctions, and public markets.

- There are little to no market opportunities that support agricultural productivity of the land. (0 points)

⁵ The viability of the site for continued agricultural production, including, but not limited to: Soil types; suitability for producing different types or varieties of crops; and water availability. (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(h))

⁶ The likelihood of the conversion of the site to nonagricultural or more highly developed usage. (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(c))

⁷ Farm-to-market access. (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(h))

- There are adequate market opportunities that support agricultural productivity of the land. (1-2 points)
- There are superior market opportunities that support agricultural productivity of the land. (3-4 points)

4. On-site Infrastructure

How well is the land's agricultural productivity supported by on-site production and support facilities such as barns, irrigation systems, crop processing and storage facilities, wells, housinghouses, livestock sheds, and other farming infrastructure?⁸

Score 0 - 4 points based on how well the land's agricultural productivity is supported. For example:

- There are no on-site production and support facilities, even though they are needed, to support the agricultural productivity of the land. (0 points)
- The agricultural productivity of the land is supported by production and support facilities off-site. (1 – 2 points)
- There are on-site production and support facilities to support the agricultural productivity of the land. (3 – 4 points)

5. Building Envelope

How much of the property is included in the building envelope?

- The size of the building envelope is not appropriate for the size of the farm. (0 points)
- The size of the building envelope is appropriate for the size of the farm. (1 - 4 points)

6. Farmland Stewardship

What stewardship practices are in place to benefit fish and other wildlife habitat?

The focus of the stewardship practices is on providing habitat for salmon, other fish and other wildlife species, migratory birds, and endangered, threatened or sensitive species.⁹

Types of stewardship practices must include practices from a recognized program or published guidelines. Examples are:

- ✓ Habitat land is set aside which meets minimum guidelines for endangered species recovery as described by the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration or the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The land set aside may not exceed the maximum thresholds set in the Open Space Tax Act.

⁸ The viability of the site for continued agricultural production, including, but not limited to: On-site production and support facilities such as barns, irrigation systems, crop processing and storage facilities, wells, housing, livestock sheds, and other farming infrastructure. (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(h))

⁹ Benefits to salmonids (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(e)), benefits to other fish and wildlife habitat (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(f)), integration with recovery efforts for endangered, threatened, or sensitive species (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(g)), and migratory bird habitat and forage area (RCW 79A.15.130(9)(i)(v)).

- ✓ Enrollment in one or more conservation incentive programs through the Natural Resources Conservation Service.~~7c~~
- ✓ Participation in the voluntary stewardship program administered by the Washington State Conservation Commission.~~7~~
- ✓ Participation in Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's habitat programs.:
- ✓ Participation in habitat improvements funded by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.:~~and~~
- ✓ Agreements or voluntary commitments made to support habitat for specific species.

Score as follows:

- There are no specific stewardship practices in place. (0 points)
- There are one or more stewardship practices planned for the future. (1-3 points)
- There are one or more stewardship practices in place. (4-6 points)
- BONUS POINTS: The stewardship practices will be included in the terms of the conservation easement as required stewardship practices for the duration of the easement. (Add 1-2 points to the score.)

7. Benefits to the Community

How will ~~protection of~~ protecting the land for agricultural purposes provide other benefits to the community? Does the community and area Native American tribes support the project?¹⁰

- The project will provide few additional benefits to the community. (0 - 3 points)
- The project will provide many additional benefits to the community. (4 - 6 points)
- There are ~~One~~ or more letters of support included in the application that demonstrate community support for the project. (2 additional points)

Benefits to the community include:

- ✓ The project is identified as a recommendation in a:
 - Coordinated region-wide prioritization effort.~~7~~
 - Critical pathways analysis.~~7~~
 - Habitat conservation plan.~~7~~
 - Limiting factors analysis.~~7-8F~~
 - Watershed plan.¹¹
- ✓ The project is consistent with a:
 - Local land use plan.~~7-8F~~
 - Regional or statewide recreational or resource plan.¹²
- ✓ The project assists in the implementation of:
 - A local shoreline master plan updated according to RCW 90.58.080, or

¹⁰ RCW 79A.15.130(9(a))

¹¹ RCW 79A.15.130(9(b))

¹² RCW 79A.15.130(9(d))

- A local comprehensive plan updated according to RCW 36.70A.130.¹³
- ✓ The project provides protection of a view or an aquifer recharge.¹⁴
- ✓ The project will provide occasional ~~or periodic~~ collection of storm water runoff.¹⁵
- ✓ The project will create agricultural jobs.¹⁶
- ✓ The project will provide some educational opportunities.¹⁷
- ✓ The project is identified in an annual or long-range plan of the local conservation district.

OBJECTIVE SCORED QUESTIONS

8. Match

Is the applicant providing additional match above the minimum requirement?

- The applicant is not providing additional match above the minimum requirements. (0 points)
- The applicant is providing 5 percent or more additional match above the minimum requirements. (2 points)

9. Easement Duration

What is the duration of the conservation easement?

- The duration of the conservation easement is forever ~~(perpetual)~~. (0 points)
- The duration of the conservation easement is not forever ~~(less than perpetual)~~. (-10 points)

¹³ RCW 79A.15.130(9(d))

¹⁴ RCW 79A.15.130(9(i))

¹⁵ RCW 79A.15.130(9(i))

¹⁶ RCW 79A.15.130(9(i))

¹⁷ RCW 79A.15.130(9(i))

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2015-24
New WWRP and ALEA Grant Program Policies**

WHEREAS, pursuant to state law, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (board) administers and approves policies that govern the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) and the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) program, and

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), with board direction, drafted ~~one~~^{two} new policies for public review and comment: ~~1) Scope Change Policy for WWRP and 2) Multi-Site Development for Trails and Water Trails~~, and

WHEREAS, RCO solicited comments from over 2,700 members of the public and posted notice on its Web site, and

WHEREAS, staff reviewed the public comments, adjusted the policies as appropriate and recommends the board approve the final draft materials as presented in Attachments B and C, and

WHEREAS, the new policies ~~is~~^{are} consistent with state law and the board's administrative rules,

~~**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the board adopts an additional Scope Change Policy for WWRP as described in Attachment B and that the policy applies to all acquisition projects funded in the WWRP, and~~

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board adopts a new policy to allow for Multi-Site Development for Trails and Water Trails as described in Attachment C and that the policy applies to applications in the ALEA program and the Trails and Water Access categories of the WWRP, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board directs RCO staff to incorporate these changes in the appropriate policy manuals with language that reflects the policy intent; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that these policies shall be effective beginning with the 2016 grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: Ted Willhite

Resolution seconded by: Mike Deller

Adopted Date: November 18, 2015

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2015-25
Conversion Request: Vancouver Waterworks Park (RCO #84-9015D)**

WHEREAS, the City of Vancouver used a grant from state bonds and the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to develop the Waterworks Park; and

WHEREAS, the water utility and security improvements to Water Station #1 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 site, 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 and will expand the city's park system in an area that had been identified in its comprehensive plan as needing additional recreation opportunities, 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 Project #84-9015D as presented to the board, contingent upon completion of conversion policy requirements for complying with the National Historic Preservation Act; 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 moved by: Jed Herman

Resolution seconded by: Ted Willhite

Adopted Date: November 19, 2015

**Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
Resolution 2015-26
Conversion Request: Mountlake Terrace Jack Long Park (RCO #68-096A, #68-099D)**

WHEREAS, the City of Mountlake Terrace used grants from state bonds and the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to acquire a portion of and develop the Jack Long Park; and

WHEREAS, the city installed wireless equipment and an emergency radio system that converted 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 site, has an appraised value that is equivalent to 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 and will expand one the city's parks that had been identified in its comprehensive plan recommendations on acquiring additional land for parks, 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, 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 Project #68-096A and #68-099D as presented to the board, contingent upon completion of conversion policy requirements for complying with the National Historic Preservation Act; and

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

Resolution moved by: Mike Deller

Resolution seconded by: Pete Mayer

Adopted Date: November 19, 2015