



STATE OF WASHINGTON

RECREATION AND CONSERVATION OFFICE

March 2008

**Item #6: Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria and Process**

Prepared By: Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Habitat Section Manager
Bill Koss, Planner, Washington State Parks and Recreation

Presented By: Marguerite Austin, Recreation and Habitat Section Manager

**Approved by the
Director:**

Proposed Action: Decision

Summary

In January 2008, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) reviewed changes proposed for the State Parks category of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP). The revisions were made in response to a request from the State Parks and Recreation Commission to modify the evaluation process and criteria to better meet the needs and priorities of the Commission. A draft proposal was submitted to the State Parks Commission for consideration at their January 18, 2008 meeting. This memo presents the final proposal and Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) staff's recommendation for Board consideration. If approved, the proposed changes will be implemented for the 2008 grants cycle.

Staff Recommendation

RCO staff recommends adoption of the State Parks category evaluation process in Attachment A, WWRP-State Parks Category Project Evaluation Process and adoption of the evaluation criteria in Attachment B, WWRP-State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria.

Resolution 2008-011 is provided for Board consideration.



Background

The Washington State Legislature established WWRP in 1990. The State Parks category in the Outdoor Recreation account is open only for projects proposed by the State Parks and Recreation Commission. The Recreation and Conservation Funding Board approves policies that govern WWRP. The Board adopted Resolution 2007-30, Evaluation Process for the State Parks Category, at its November 2007 meeting. The resolution delegates the evaluation and ranking of Commission projects to the Washington State Parks Commission, which then submits the projects, evaluation process, and criteria to the Board for approval and project funding. The policy revision was approved by the Board for the following reasons:

- The Commission is the sole eligible applicant for the category.
- The WWRP statute does not include specific criteria for assessing projects in the category.
- Delegating the project evaluation and ranking process reduces the demand on RCO staff resources and avoids duplication of evaluation processes.
- The new process eliminates the problem of having the Commission reorder a ranked list that was provided by a volunteer panel.
- The Commission can place greater emphasis on the priorities it establishes through planning and prioritization.

State Parks staff drafted details of the evaluation process and criteria for the State Parks category. The Board and RCO staff recommended modifications, which have been incorporated. Those modifications include:

- Expanding the timeline to allow flexibility to meet Commission deadlines.
- Expanding the criteria to include explanations or elements that applicants must address to meet the intent of individual criterion.
- Using examples, where appropriate, in the criteria.
- Adding suggestions for how points may be awarded.
- Adjusting the scoring to increase the points awarded for the Project Design, Immediacy of Threat, and Application of Sustainability criteria.

The process is outlined in Attachment A, *WWRP-State Parks Category Project Evaluation Process*. The proposed evaluation instrument is in Attachment B, *WWRP-State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria*.

The proposed process and criteria are currently out for public review. Staff will provide a summary of comments received to the Board at its March meeting.

Analysis

RCW 79A.15, which established WWRP, provides direction for the Board to prioritize projects based on specific criteria for various categories. It is silent on elements to include when considering the State Parks category. In the past, the Board adopted criteria that incorporated elements that were used for other categories in WWRP.

In November, the Board adopted a policy that allows the Commission to develop criteria for the State Parks category. The proposed evaluation instrument places greater emphasis on criteria important to the State Parks Commission.

A comparison of the scoring and criteria for the existing and proposed instruments is shown in Table 1. The changes proposed for the evaluation instrument are shown in Attachment B. The existing evaluation instrument is shown in Attachment C for reference.

Table 1: Existing and Proposed Evaluation Criteria

State Parks Category Scoring Matrix						
Score	#	Existing Criteria	Max Points	#	Proposed Criteria	Max Points
Team	1	Public Need	10	1	Public Need	5
Team	2	Project Significance	5	2	Project Significance	15
Team	3	Project Design (dev)	10	3	Project Design (dev)	5
Team	4	Immediacy of Threat (acq)	10	4	Immediacy of Threat (acq)	5
Team	5	Site Suitability	15			
Team	6	Expansion / Phased Project	5	5	Expansion / Phased Project	10
Team	7	Diversity of Recreation	10	6	Multiple Fund Sources	5
Team	8	Project Support	10	7	Readiness to Proceed	5
Team	9	Cost Efficiencies	5	8	Application of Sustainability	5
RCO	10	Population Proximity	5	9	Population Proximity	3
		Total	75		Total	53

Table 2 shows some of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed criteria. It specifically highlights the differences between the existing criteria and those proposed by State Parks. RCO staff concludes that these new criteria will meet the intent of the policies adopted by the Board.

Table 2: Pros and Cons of Existing and Proposed Evaluation Criteria

State Parks Category Criteria		
Criteria	Pros	Cons
Public Need	Maintains a key criterion used to assess projects Focus is on State Parks approved plans and priorities	Does not assess the relationship to opportunities currently available within a given region Focus is on State Parks plans only
Project Design	Adds universal-barrier free design as an element to consider, otherwise no major change	
Immediacy of Threat	No major change	
Site Suitability	Elements of this criterion are folded into the Project Significance question for all projects, and the Project Design criterion for development projects	No special emphasis on this criterion for selecting property proposed for acquisition
Expansion/Phased Project	No major change	
Diversity of Recreation	Elements of this question are folded into the Project Significance criterion	Less emphasis is placed on the variety of recreational opportunities a specific site can support
Multiple Fund Sources	Considers partnerships that help implement projects	Does not require documented proof when projects are evaluated Gives points for fund sources that later may not materialize Risks later reductions in project scope if funds do not come through
Project Support	Community support may be considered during the planning phases	Does not specifically give weight to community interest in the projects submitted by State Parks, despite the fact that this criterion was emphasized in the statute for all other categories of WWRP General support in the planning phase does not always carry-through during the specific site development phase
Readiness to Proceed	New criterion that emphasizes funding projects that can be implemented in a timely manner	May not go far enough to help ensure timely completion of projects

Criteria	Pros	Cons
-----------------	-------------	-------------

Cost Efficiencies		Partnerships that reduce government costs has been a key criterion for most Board adopted evaluation instruments
Application of Sustainability	<p>Adds a new criterion that considers sustainable designs and use of best management practices</p> <p>Use of this criteria can serve as a pilot to determine how to recognize and reward applicants for environmentally sensitive designs when they submit projects in other categories or programs</p>	Does not provide specific elements to determine if the design is sustainable
Population Proximity	<p>Still gives priority to projects that are located close to where people live and work</p> <p>The points were reduced to place greater emphasis on other key criteria</p>	Sites further away from populated areas may meet Commission priorities better than sites near populated areas

Next Steps

If adopted by the Board, RCO staff will update Manual #10a, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, Outdoor Recreation Account: Policies and Project, and notify interested parties of the changes for 2008.

Attachments

Resolution 2008-011

- A. WWRP State Parks Category Evaluation Process
- B. WWRP Proposed State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria
- C. WWRP Existing State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria

RESOLUTION #2008-011

State Parks Category Evaluation Criteria and Process

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) approves policies that govern Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP); and

WHEREAS, the State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) wishes to modify the evaluation process and criteria for the State Parks Category of the WWRP to better meet the needs and priorities of the Commission and reduce duplicative staff efforts; and

WHEREAS, at its November 2007 meeting, the Board adopted Resolution 2007-30, Evaluation Process for the State Parks Category, delegating to the Commission the evaluation and ranking of Commission projects; and

WHEREAS, establishing such a process would further the Board's strategic goal to "[e]valuate policies to help clients strategically invest in the protection, restoration, and development of habitat and recreation opportunities"; and

WHEREAS, the RCO staff has solicited and considered public comment on this process;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board does hereby direct its staff to implement in the 2008 State Parks WWRP grant cycle using the evaluation criteria and process described in Attachments A and B of the memorandum attached hereto.

Resolution moved by: _____

Resolution seconded by: _____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: March 27, 2008

Attachment A:

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program State Parks Category

Proposed Evaluation Process

March 1, 2008

Public Visibility Steps

1. The State Parks and Recreation Commission (Commission) will review the list of candidate projects at a spring work session. This meeting is open to public, but no public comment is taken.
2. State Parks staff provides the report on the preliminary ranked list to the Commission, which distributes it to the public for comment.
3. State Parks staff requests Commission approval of the final ranked list at the August Commission meeting. This meeting is open to public. Members of the public may comment at the meeting or in writing. State Parks staff provide a summary of written comments for Commission consideration.
4. The Commission submits the list to the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board (Board) for final approval and inclusion with the Board's recommendation to the Governor and the Legislature.

Administrative Steps

1. State Parks staff submits projects to the Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) by established Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program timelines.
2. RCO staff reviews state parks category projects to determine eligibility before the evaluation.
3. State Parks will identify "top or high" priority projects before the evaluation meeting. High priority projects are projects that have some element of urgency such as matching funds, a strict timeline, or urgency by a willing seller.
4. The state parks category evaluation team has 8 to 10 members. All are State Parks staff, except that one may be a citizen representative. Members include:
 - Assistant Director of Parks Development Service Center
 - Capital Program Manager
 - Planning Program Manager
 - Stewardship Program Manager
 - Two Regional Managers
 - Two Capital Program Regional Managers
 - Program Manager
 - Citizen Representative (e.g., State Parks Foundation, nonprofit, etc.)
5. Applicants make presentations to the evaluation team, which scores all projects. RCO staff observes the evaluation meeting.

6. The evaluation meeting is open to the public. Only authorized representatives of the applicant agency or RCO staff may address the evaluation team and/or presenters.
7. The evaluation team develops the ranked list of projects by using predetermined criteria and recommending high priority projects.

Attachment B

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program State Parks Category

Proposed Evaluation Criteria

State Parks Category

This project category is reserved for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission for acquisition and/or development of state parks.

RCFB Manual 10a.

WWRP - STATE PARKS CRITERIA ANALYSIS						
Score	#	Title	A/D	Multiplier	Maximum Points	Focus
Team	1	Public Need	A/D	1	5.0	State
Team	2	Project Significance	A/D	3	15.0	State Parks
Team	3	Project Design	D	1	5.0	Technical
Team	4	Immediacy of Threat	A	1	5.0	State
Team	5	Expansion / Phased Project	A/D	2	10.0	State
Team	6	Multiple Fund Sources	A/D	1	5.0	State
Team	7	Readiness to Proceed	A/D	1	5.0	State Parks
Team	8	Shows Application of Sustainability	A/D	1	5.0	State Parks
RCO Staff	9	Population Proximity	A/D	1	3.0	State
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE					A= 53 / D= 53	

KEY:

- RCO Staff = Criteria scored by RCO staff
- Team = Criteria scored by interdisciplinary *team*
- A/D = Acquisition or Development specific question
- Mult/Mx = Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
- Focus = *State/State Parks/Technical*; Criteria based on three need factors: those that meet general *statewide* needs (often called for in RCW or the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan), those that specifically meet *State Parks'* needs, and those that meet *technical* considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
PROPOSED SCORING CRITERIA
State Parks

TEAM SCORED CRITERIA

1. **Public Need.** Describe why this facility should be built or property acquired? It is cited in CAMP (Classification and Management Plan - a State Parks Commission-approved comprehensive plan for a park), cited in the current State Parks 10 Year Capital Plan, consistent with State Parks' Centennial 2013 Vision, identified by the public, etc.

No CAMP, Master Plan, not in 10 year capital Plan or Consistent with the 2013 Centennial Vision, no or little public interest (0 points)

In 120 Parks, CAMP approved, in 10 year Capital Plan, some public support, property acquisition listed in CAMP but not essential (1-2 points)

CAMP approved, Master Plan prepared, in 10 year capital plan, property acquisition resolves management problem or needed for capital project or implements Cultural resources Plan/Stewardship Plan (3-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

2. **Project Significance.** Describe why this is a project of statewide or regional merit. Is this a 'high priority' project?

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Measure</u>
Significance	Whether the project has traits which relatively few places have, such as listing on the National Register of Historic Places, or that the park contains uncommon natural, cultural, or historic resources, or possesses uncommon recreational attributes and whether State Parks plays an essential role in ensuring that the significant trait(s) are protected, enhanced and made appropriately available to the public.
Popularity	Project at a park with high visitation or that operates at a high percent of capacity
Experience(s)	Number and quality of experience(s) provided
Uniqueness	Unique experience(s) provided
Flora/fauna	Outstanding example of specific habitat for flora and/or fauna in abundance or quality or both

Scenery	Well known for scenic qualities (e.g., cited in tourist brochures as an attractive, popular site for photography or other art, referenced in news articles, etc.)
Size	Has sufficient size to accommodate current and future uses and maintain quality of experience
Condition	Facilities (built environment) add to the visitors' experience

Normally, projects at parks offering a variety of natural resource/cultural resource/recreation resources, particularly in an area with few similar resources will score higher than those offering few or a single opportunity. However, if a single, significant need is identified and strongly met as a single element, the project can score well on this question. For example: acquisition of a rare site for a single purpose recreational opportunity; or natural or cultural resource; or developing facilities that enhance the experience at such a site (e.g., Doug's Beach – wind-surfing launch site, Peshastin Pinnacles – rock climbing, petroglyphs, etc.)..

Park not on the 120 park list, capital project or acquisition does not contain significant natural, cultural or recreation attributes (0 points)

Capital project or acquisition provides access to good quality natural, cultural or recreation attributes; noted in 10 year capital plan, CAMP or Master Plan; fills identified void..... (1-3 points)

Capital project or acquisition a priority in Master Plan, 10 year capital plan, essential element in park development, or protects vital resources..... (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

3. Project Design (development only). Describe how this project demonstrates good site and building design.

Measure the quality of the functional and aesthetic aspects of the site design as related to the site and the proposed uses. Will site resources be appropriately made available for recreation? Will environmental or other important values be protected by the proposed development? Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. Some design elements that may be considered include: accuracy of cost estimates; recreation experiences; aesthetics; maintenance; site suitability; materials; spatial relationships; and user-friendly, universally accessible design, etc.

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

4. Immediacy of Threat (acquisition only). Describe the consequences of not obtaining this land now. Consider the availability of alternatives. Where none exist, the significance of a threat may be higher.

No evidence presented.(0 points)

Minimal threat; site resource opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use in the next 36 months..... (1-2 points)

Actions are under consideration that could result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use(3 points)

Actions will be taken that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use

or

A threat situation has occurred or is imminent and has led a land trust to acquire rights in the land at the request of the applicant agency..... (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

5. Expansion/Phased Project. Is this a continuation of a previous project? When did the previous project start and end (if applicable)? Is this a distinct stand-alone phase?

Not part of phased plan, or expansion project, or last phase completed more than 4 years ago.....(0 points)

Previous phase completed 2-3 years ago (1-2 points)

A key starting point for a multi-phase project or builds on a project started less than 2 years prior; expands a popular or notable site/facility (3-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

6. Multiple Funding Sources. Are there multiple funding sources proposed to support this project? A fund source must contribute 5% or more of the total project cost in cash, grants, or in-kind services to qualify as a fund source.

No other fund sources (0 points)

One other fund source..... (1-2 points)

More than one other fund source..... (3-4 points)

AND

Sources outside of the state budget receive a point if they exceed 25% of the grant request amount (1 point)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

- 7. Readiness to Proceed.** Is the project fully designed and permitted (development) or is there a written sales agreement with the property owner (acquisition)? Are there any significant local zoning or permitting issues?

Acquisition: No signed sales agreement with landowner.
Development: Construction drawings less than 60% completed and no permits in-hand (0 points)

Acquisition: Signed sales agreement completed;
Development: All permits in-hand (1-5 points)
Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

- 8. Application of Sustainability.** Does the proposed design or acquisition meet accepted sustainability standards, best management practices, and/or stewardship of natural or cultural resources?

Acquisition: Project provides no evidence of protecting natural or cultural resources.
Development: Project does not demonstrate a high standard of stewardship (e.g., energy conservation, waste reduction, use of sustainable products, etc)(0 points)

Acquisition: Project protects key natural/cultural resources.
Development: Project demonstrates highest standards of stewardship (e.g., energy conservation, waste reduction, use of sustainable products, etc) (1-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

SCORED BY RCO STAFF

9. **Proximity to Human Populations. Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities and towns, and county density?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.25.250 (RCFB and urban area parks)

This question is scored by RCO staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive a score, the map must show the project location and project boundary in relationship to a city's or town's urban growth boundary.

- a. The project is within the urban growth area boundary of a city or town with a population of 5,000 or more.

Yes: 1.5 points

No: 0 points

AND

- b. The project is within a county with a population density of 250 or more people per square mile.

Yes: 1.5 points

No: 0 points

The result from "a" is added to the result from "b." Projects in cities with a population of more than 5,000 *and* within high density counties receive points from both "a" and "b."

RCO staff awards a maximum of 3

Revised November 2007

**Attachment C: Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program State Parks Category
 Existing Evaluation Criteria**

State Parks Category

This project category is reserved for the Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission for acquisition and/or development of state parks.

IAC Manual 10.

WWRP - State Parks Criteria Analysis					
Score	#	Title	A/D	Mult/Mx	Focus
Team	1	Public Need	A/D	2/10.0	Loc
Team	2	Project Significance	A/D	1/5.0	St
Team	3	Project Design	D	2/10.0	Tech
Team	4	Immediacy of Threat	A	2/10.0	St
Team	5	Site Suitability	A/D	3/15.0	Tech
Team	6	Expansion / Phased Project	A/D	1/5.0	St
Team	7	Diversity of Recreation	A/D	2/10.0	St
Team	8	Project Support	A/D	2/10.0	St/Loc
Team	9	Cost Efficiencies	A/D	1/5.0	Loc
Prescore	10	Population Proximity	A/D	0.5/5.0	St
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE				A= 75 / D= 75	

KEY:

- Prescore = Criteria *prescored* by IAC staff
- Team = Criteria scored by interdisciplinary *team*
- A/D = Acquisition or Development specific question
- Mult/Mx = Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
- Focus = *St/Loc/Tech*; Criteria orientation in accordance with SCORP policy of developing evaluation systems based on three need factors: those that meet general *statewide* needs (often called for in RCW or SCORP), those that meet *local* needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans), and those that meet *technical* considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program
EXISTING SCORING CRITERIA

State Parks

TEAM SCORED

1. **PUBLIC NEED. Considering the availability of existing sites within at least 15 miles of the project site, what is the need for additional sites?**

Acquisition/Development; *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007*, Chapters 1, 5.

Establish need by inventorying all available sites of comparable opportunities (quality / quantity / use) within the minimum 15 mile service radius *and* considering whether or not the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan. Other considerations:

- Are nearby sites used to capacity?
- Are there unserved or under served user groups?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised May 7, 2003

TEAM SCORED

2. PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE. The extent that the project is of statewide/regional/local significance.

Acquisition/Development

Assess the degree of importance the project has to the state as a whole. A number of factors should be considered with the minimum factors being the degree of uniqueness (e.g. an island chain) and the scale of the project or resource (e.g. a large water body).

- a. *No evidence* of statewide/regional significance (ordinary and of moderate to small scale)..... (0 points)
- b. The project is of *regional significance* (special/ordinary and of moderate to small scale)..... (1-2 points)
- c. The project is of *major regional significance* (very special and of at least moderate scale) (3 points)
- d. The project is of *statewide significance* (unique/very special and of broad scale).
..... (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1. Revised June 2, 1995

TEAM SCORED

3. PROJECT DESIGN. Does the project demonstrate good design criteria; does it make the best use of the site?

Development

To measure the quality of the functional and aesthetic aspects of the site plan as particularly related to the site and the proposed uses. Some design elements that may be considered include:

- Phasing
- Materials
- Maintenance
- Risk Management
- Accuracy of Cost Estimates
- User Friendly/Barrier Free
- Space Relationships
- Recreation Experiences
- Aesthetics.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2. Revised June 5, 1995

TEAM SCORED

4. IMMEDIACY OF THREAT. The extent that there is a threat to the public availability of the resources the site possesses.

Acquisition

Consider the availability of alternatives. Where none exist, the significance of a threat may be higher.

- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. *Minimal threat*; site resource opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use *in the next 36 months* (1-2 points)
- c. Actions are under *consideration* that *could* result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use (3 points)
- d. *Actions will be taken* that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use

or

A threat situation has occurred or is imminent and has led a *land trust* to acquire rights in the property at the request of the applicant agency.(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2

Revised July 1996

TEAM SCORED

5. SITE SUITABILITY. Is the site well suited for the intended recreational uses?

Acquisition/Development

Compare environmental and other site features against the proposed use of the site. Examine the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site, to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. In general, sites most compatible to the uses proposed score higher.

- a. **Acquisition projects.** Is the site to be acquired well-suited for the intended recreational/environmental uses?
- or**
- b. **Development projects.** Will site resources be appropriately made available for recreation; will their environmental or other important values be protected by proposed development?

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.
Revised July 1996

TEAM SCORED

6. EXPANSION/PHASED. Will the acquisition or development project expand an existing recreation area or facility?

Acquisition/Development. *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007*, Chapter 5.

Recognizes that expansion/phased projects generally provide greater benefit-to-cost ratios than new projects. Projects that add to existing state assets also often provide greater management flexibility and resource diversity.

- a. The project *does not* expand or develop an already existing site (0 points)
- b. The project acquires or develops a *minor* but *not* crucial parcel or facilities to the existing site (1-2 points)
- c. The project acquires or develops a *major* or significant parcel or facilities to the existing site (3 points)
- d. The project acquires or develops an addition to an already existing project of *statewide significance* (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.
May 7, 2003

Revised

TEAM SCORED

7. DIVERSITY OF RECREATIONAL/ENVIRONMENTAL/OTHER RESOURCES/USES. To what extent does this project provide diversity of possible recreational resource experiences or activities?

Acquisition/Development. *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007*, Chapters 1 and 5.

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

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.
May 7, 2003

Revised

TEAM SCORED

8. **PROJECT SUPPORT. The extent that the public (statewide, community, and/or user groups) has been provided with an adequate *opportunity to become informed, and/or support* for the project seems apparent.**

Acquisition/Development

Broadly interpret the term *project support* to include, but not be limited to:

- ▶ Extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
 - ▶ The extent that there is project support, including:
 - ▶ Voter approved initiatives/bond issues/referenda
 - ▶ Ordinance and resolution adoption
 - ▶ Public meeting attendance
 - ▶ Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user/"friends" groups
 - ▶ Media coverage
 - ▶ The extent to which the public was involved in a comprehensive planning process that includes this project.
- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. Marginal community support. Opportunities for only minimal public involvement (i.e. a single adoption hearing),
and/or
Little evidence that the public supports the project (1-2 points)
- c. Adequate support (3 points)
- d. The public has received ample and varied opportunity to provide meaningful input into the project, and there is overwhelming support;
and/or
The public was so supportive from the project's inception that an extensive public participation process was not necessary (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised March 1997

TEAM SCORED

9. **COST EFFICIENCIES. The extent that the project demonstrates efficiencies and/or reduces government costs through documented use of:**
- ▶ **Volunteers,**
 - ▶ **Donations,**
 - ▶ ***Signed* cooperative agreements or**
 - ▶ ***Signed* memoranda of understanding (such as no cost easements/leases, maintenance/operation arrangements, or similar cost savings).**

Acquisition/Development. *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007*, Chapter 5.

- a. No evidence presented. (0 point)
- b. The benefit of any such agreement is *marginal*. (1-2 points)
- c. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *moderate* efficiencies and/or savings. (3 points)
- d. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *substantial* efficiencies and/or savings. (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised May 7, 2003

SCORED BY IAC STAFF

10. **PROXIMITY TO HUMAN POPULATIONS. Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities/towns, and county density?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.25.250 (IAC urban area parks)

This question is scored by IAC staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive credit, the map must describe the project area and contain a circle with a five-mile radius. As its hub, the circle must use the point on the project's boundary closest to a city or town. The single city or town (if any, including urban growth area boundary) with the highest population touched by the circle is counted in part "a," below. The result from "a" (cities) is added to the result from "b" (counties). This takes into account that counties with high *average* densities are made up of both high and low density areas. Projects located near cities over 5000 population *and* within high density counties receive points from both "a" and "b".

- a. Within 5 miles of a GMA urban growth area boundary or the boundary of an incorporated city/town. In either case, the score is based on the city/town population (OFM):

▶	0 -	4,999.....	(0 points)
▶	5,000 -	9,999	(1 point)
▶	10,000 -	29,999.....	(2 points)
▶	30,000 -	149,999	(3 points)
▶	150,000 -	299,999.....	(4 points)
▶	300,000 -	and above	(5 points)

- b. In a county with a population density (OFM) of:

▶	0 -	249.....	(0 points)
▶	250 -	324	(1 point)
▶	325 -	399.....	(2 points)
▶	400 -	474	(3 points)
▶	475 -	549.....	(4 points)
▶	550 -	and above	(5 points)

IAC staff awards a maximum of 10 points that are later multiplied by 0.5

Revised May 7, 2003