

Item # 10

**WWRP  
Phased Projects and Future  
Preference**

June 2007

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Background**

- **Phased Projects**
  - Phases are encouraged and have been successfully implemented
  - Initial phase funded and implemented but subsequent phases may/may not score well in the evaluation process
  - Phases funded and not implemented
- **Issue raised by the Board**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Background cont.**

Questions to consider

- Should there be preference given for projects that ranked within funding range one year but not the next?
- Should IAC reward applicants implementing various phases of multi-phased projects?
- If a previous phase is not completed should the applicant be penalized in future phases?
- Other?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Phasing: Existing Policies

IAC Manual 10, WWRP: Policies

- Projects that are costly
- Projects that exceed grant limits
- Projects that take several years to complete

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Phasing: Existing Policies cont.

- Parameters for phased/staged projects:
  - Approval limited to that stage
  - No endorsement given/implied for future stages
  - Viable or complete project
  - Separate application for each stage
  - Progress and sponsor performance on other grants may be considered by IAC when making decisions on current project proposals

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Phasing: Examples

- Trails
  - Acquisition of right-of-way
  - Development (includes permitting)
- Local/State Parks
  - Implementing existing master plans
  - Must result in a viable recreation experience
- Habitat Areas
  - Large scale acquisitions

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Phasing: Options

- **Automatic**
  - Limits funding options for other projects
- **Evaluation**
  - Team scored criteria
  - Staff scored criteria
- **Other alternatives**
  - Raise/lower cap
  - Allow for planning grants

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Pros & Cons

### Make Changes

- Reward applicants for planning ahead
- Allows applicants to plan for large scale projects that require multiple funding partners/resources
- Could reduce the competitiveness of the program
- Could reduce reappropriation requests
- Some jurisdictions may not want to take the risk of whether funds will be available for subsequent phases

### Do Not Change

- Reduces funds available for emerging priorities
- May negatively impact smaller projects
- May discourage new applicants and/or projects
- Use existing Board authority to fund projects.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Phasing: Next Steps

- June – Direction from the Board
- July – Draft changes/options and begin public review process
- August – Public review of changes/options
- September – Report to Board to finalize option
- October – Final draft for public review
- November – Board action on recommendation
- January 2008 – Application Workshops

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---