

Background

As part of its fiscal accountability legislation¹, the Partnership is required to work with the RCO and other agencies to develop fiscal incentives and disincentives that implement the Partnership's Action Agenda, which identifies strategies to restore the health of the Puget Sound by 2020.

In addition, the legislature amended the ALEA, WWRP, and SRFB grant program statutes to align the programs with Action Agenda priorities. The legislation requires the board and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) to:

1. Prohibit funding for any project designed to address the restoration of Puget Sound if that project is in conflict with the Action Agenda (effective January 1, 2010);
2. Consider whether projects are referenced in the Action Agenda; and
3. Give funding preference to Puget Sound partners without giving less preferential treatment to entities that are not eligible to be Puget Sound partners.

Analysis

Staff worked with a group of stakeholders to develop policy proposals that include the following:

1. Revise program eligibility requirements to exclude projects in conflict with the Action Agenda
2. Revise program criteria to reflect whether eligible projects are referenced in the Action Agenda
3. Give funding preference to Puget Sound partners in comparison to other entities that are eligible to be a Puget Sound partner without giving less preferential treatment to entities that are not eligible to be Puget Sound partners

Stakeholders included the following:

Name	Organization
Bill Koss	State Parks and Recreation Commission
Peter Mayer	Vancouver-Clark Parks and Recreation, Washington Recreation and Park Association
Tami Pokorny	Jefferson County
Wade Alonzo	Department of Natural Resources
Sharon Claussen	King County Parks and Recreation
Linda Lyshall	Puget Sound Partnership
Mike Denny	Walla Walla Conservation District
Mike Tobin	North Yakima Conservation District
Dona Wuthnow	ALEA Advisory Committee, San Juan Co. Parks and Rec
Peter Dykstra	Trust for Public Land
Bill Robinson	Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition, The Nature Conservancy

¹ RCW 90.71.340

Proposal #1: Exclude from Eligibility Projects that are in Conflict with the Action Agenda

The legislation for the SRFB, ALEA, and WWRP Habitat Conservation Account includes the following language:

“After January 1, 2010, any project designed to address the restoration of Puget Sound may be funded under this chapter only if the project is not in conflict with the action agenda developed by the Puget Sound partnership under RCW 90.71.310.”

RCWs 77.85.130; 79.105.150; and 79A.15.040

Policy Approach

Since the legislation is effective January 1, 2010, the Partnership reviewed the 2009-11 ALEA and WWRP Habitat Conservation Account ranked project lists before the board approved them in July 2009. The Partnership’s deputy director responded that none of the projects were in conflict with the Action Agenda.

While this approach worked as an interim step, staff believes that it is inefficient to conduct the review after projects have been through the full application and evaluation process. Rather, the RCO should implement the legislation through the eligibility policy. Specifically, policy should state that a project that addresses the restoration of Puget Sound but that is in conflict with the Action Agenda is ineligible for program funds. This approach saves time and money for both the RCO and project sponsors.

Proposed Process

The Partnership defines the Puget Sound basin as the geographic areas within Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA) 1 through 19, inclusive. The Partnership suggested that RCO ensure that affected projects within these areas are not in conflict with the following Action Agenda priorities:

- Priority A: Protecting intact ecosystem processes, structures, and functions.
- Priority B: Restoring ecosystem processes, structures, and functions.
- Priority C: Reducing the sources of water pollution

The Partnership also provided staff with the following definition of “in conflict with the Action Agenda”:

- Projects that, when completed, result in water quality degradation in Puget Sound in which impacts are not fully mitigated using appropriate state approved protocols.
- Projects that, when completed, result in loss of ecosystem processes, structure, or functions in which impacts are not fully mitigated using appropriate state approved protocols.

Stakeholders responded that this definition does not provide clarity to applicants and grant managers about what specifically would cause a project to be ineligible for funding. Consequently, stakeholders refined the definition into questions for sponsors to answer on a self-certification letter that would be submitted with potential WWRP and ALEA projects. Stakeholders then developed a process by which the Partnership would review and comment on each sponsor's self-certification letter.

Stakeholders, including Partnership staff, agreed that applicants to ALEA and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account for Puget Sound projects should submit a letter with their application to RCO certifying that their project is not in conflict with the Action Agenda (Attachment A). This letter should include the definition provided by the Partnership, but the definition should be more specific about what "appropriate state approved protocols" means. RCO would then submit the self-certification letters to the Partnership, which would comment on whether the projects are in conflict with the Action Agenda before the project review meeting with the grant manager.

If a project is ineligible for funding under this policy, the applicant has standard appeal mechanisms available under WAC 286-04-085.

Proposal #2: Consider Whether Projects are Referenced in the Action Agenda

In order for the board to give funding consideration to projects that are referenced in the Action Agenda, the program criteria must reflect whether projects are referenced in the Action Agenda. The ALEA grant program has existing criteria under "Project Need" that asks how the project addresses priorities in various plans. The WWRP's Habitat Conservation Account also has criteria about the project's connection to various plans under the "Ecological/Biological Characteristics, The Bigger Picture" section.

Staff recommends that a question be included in the evaluation criteria for ALEA and WWRP's Habitat Conservation Account that addresses whether a project within the Puget Sound is referenced in the Action Agenda. Point values would not change, but the evaluator has the ability within the current point system to give points based on the answer to this question. The proposed language is shown in Attachment B.

Stakeholders agreed that applicants whose projects are within Puget Sound should submit a written narrative with their application explaining how the project is referenced in the Action Agenda and provide a page number citation to the reference. Applicants who have difficulty indicating the reference can meet with RCO and Partnership staff to review the project and identify the project's reference in the Action Agenda. This meeting would take place before project review meetings and before evaluations.

Proposal #3: Give Funding Preference to Designated Puget Sound Partners Without Giving Less Preferential Treatment to Entities Ineligible to be Partners

The SRFB, ALEA and WWRP's legislation includes the following language:

When administering funds under this chapter, the committee² shall give preference only to Puget Sound partners, as defined in RCW 90.71.010, in comparison to other entities that are eligible to be included in the definition of Puget Sound partner. Entities that are not eligible to be a Puget Sound partner due to geographic location, composition, exclusion from the scope of the Puget Sound action agenda developed by the Puget Sound partnership under RCW 90.71.310, or for any other reason, shall not be given less preferential treatment than Puget Sound partners.

RCWs 77.85.240; 79.105.610; and 79A.15.140

"Puget Sound partner" means an entity that has been recognized by the partnership, as provided in RCW 90.71.340, as having consistently achieved outstanding progress in implementing the 2020 action agenda.

RCW 90.71.010

The Puget Sound Partnership has not yet determined a method for designating Puget Sound partners. It is difficult to establish policies for giving funding preference to partners until the Partnership determines how partners will be designated.

Stakeholders would like opportunity to engage with RCO about setting up a funding preference system. Many stakeholders are concerned that they could be disadvantaged if the funding preference system gives preferential treatment to Puget Sound projects over projects outside Puget Sound.

Staff proposes that the board add placeholder language to the ALEA and WWRP Habitat Conservation Account policies noting that the board will adopt policies for giving preferential treatment to partners after a method is determined for designating Puget Sound partners. The proposed language is shown in Attachment C.

Public Review

On October 18, 2009, staff circulated a draft to about 2500 people who had expressed an interest to RCO in hearing about issues related to the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account, the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program, and the Salmon Recovery Funding Board grant programs.

Eleven people commented on the proposal. Attachment D includes the comments received, in summary format. Several comments suggest limiting proposals #1 and #2 to SRFB, ALEA and

² Funding boards RCFB and SRFB

WWRP Habitat Conservation Account. One comment recommends applying proposal #1 to all RCO grant programs. One comment recommends applying proposal #1 to Puget Sound restoration projects only. Several comments expressed concern about giving preferential treatment to the Puget Sound basin and recommend developing clear criteria for applying the legislation to grant programs.

Next Steps

If the board approves the policy revisions, RCO staff will update the manuals and implement the policies for the 2010 grant cycle and beyond.

Additional Policy Revisions

After the Partnership determines a method for designating Puget Sound partners, staff will continue to work with stakeholders on developing a funding preference system that does not give less preferential treatment to entities ineligible to be Puget Sound partners.

Attachments

Resolution #2009-27

- A. Draft self-certification letter
- B. Proposed program criteria
- C. Proposed funding preference placeholder language
- D. Public comments on the proposal

RESOLUTION #2009-27

Aligning ALEA and WWRP with the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda

WHEREAS, the 2007 Legislature required the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Habitat Conservation Account prohibit funding any project designed to address the restoration of Puget Sound that is in conflict with the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda by January 1, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the 2007 Legislature required the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board to consider whether projects funded by the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program's Habitat Conservation Account are referenced in the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda; and

WHEREAS, the 2007 Legislature mandated the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board give funding preference to projects in the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program that are sponsored by entities designated Puget Sound partners by the Puget Sound Partnership without giving less preferential treatment to entities ineligible to be partners; and

WHEREAS, Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) staff developed and circulated a policy proposal for review and comment among people that have asked to be kept informed about the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program; and

WHEREAS, adopting these revisions would meet the statutory requirements and would further the board's strategic goals to "[f]und the best projects as determined by the evaluation process" and to evaluate and develop strategic investment policies and plans so that projects selected for funding meet the state's recreation and conservation needs;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the board does hereby adopt policies to make WWRP Habitat Conservation Account and ALEA projects that are in conflict with the Action Agenda ineligible for funding; add a question to the evaluation criteria for ALEA and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account that addresses whether a project within the Puget Sound is referenced in the Action Agenda; and add placeholder language to the ALEA and WWRP policies noting that the board will adopt policies for giving preferential treatment to partners after a method is determined for designating Puget Sound partners; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the board directs RCO staff to implement this revision beginning with the 2010 WWRP grant cycle.

Resolution moved by: _____

Resolution seconded by: _____

Adopted/Defeated/Deferred (underline one)

Date: _____

ATTACHMENT A: DRAFT SELF-CERTIFICATION LETTER

Staff proposes requiring applicants of ALEA and WWRP Habitat Conservation Account submit the following letter with their application.

This letter certifies that the (Project Name) is not in conflict with the Action Agenda developed by the Puget Sound Partnership under RCW 90.71.310. I understand that a project designed to address the restoration of Puget Sound cannot be funded if it is in conflict with the Action Agenda.*

The following is a brief description of the (Project Name):

I certify that this project is within the Puget Sound basin (defined for these purposes as within Water Resource Inventory Area's 1-19)

I further certify that this project is not in conflict with the Action Agenda developed by the Puget Sound Partnership because (check all that apply):

When completed, this project will not result in water quality degradation in Puget Sound and meets or exceeds all permitting requirements.

When completed, this project will not result in loss of ecosystem processes, structure, or functions and meets or exceeds all permitting requirements.

Applicant Name: _____

Applicant Signature: _____

Date: _____

*Relevant program legislation will be referenced: either RCW 77.85.130; 79.105.150; or 79A.15.040.

ATTACHMENT B: PROPOSED PROGRAM CRITERIA

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account

Proposed Addition to ALEA Project Need criteria in Manual 21 (underline indicates new language):

What is the need for this project?

Protection and Enhancement Projects:

- How does the project address priorities contained in an approved watershed plan, shoreline master plan, species recovery plan, or other state or local plan? Is it mentioned specifically in the plan?
- How does it enhance or complement other nearby protection and enhancement efforts in the watershed or on the shoreline?
- How is the need for this project supported in studies, surveys, and other analyses?
- Will the project benefit sensitive, threatened or endangered species or critical plant and animal communities? If so, how?
- For Water Resource Inventory Areas 1-19, how is the project referenced in the Action Agenda developed by the Puget Sound Partnership? * **

*The Action Agenda can be found at www.psp.wa.gov.

**Evaluators are instructed to ignore this question for projects outside Water Resource Inventory Areas 1-19.

WWRP's Habitat Conservation Account

Proposed addition to WWRP's Habitat Conservation Account Ecological/Biological Characteristics criteria in Manual 10b (underline indicates new language):

Ecological/Biological Characteristics. Why is the site worthy of long-term conservation?

RCW 79A.15.060 (6)(a)(iii, v - vii, xi, xiv); (6)(b)(ii)

"Paint a picture" of your project for the evaluators - the what, where, and why. This is the "heart" of your presentation and evaluators will draw conclusions based on the information presented about the quality and function of the habitat and the demonstrated need to protect it for fish and/or wildlife.

THE BIGGER PICTURE. How is this project supported by a current plan (i.e., species management population plan, habitat conservation, local, watershed, statewide, agency, or conservation), or a coordinated region-wide prioritization effort? What is the status of the plan? Does this project assist in implementation of a local shoreline master program, updated according to RCW 90.58.080 or local comprehensive plans updated according to RCW 36.70A.130? What process was used to identify this project as a priority? What specific role does this project play in a broader watershed or landscape picture? Is it part

of a phased project? Is it a stand-alone site/habitat? For Water Resource Inventory Areas 1-19, how is the project referenced in the Action Agenda developed by the Puget Sound Partnership? * **

Local agencies only - What is the statewide significance of the project site? Does it meet priorities identified in a state plan? What elevates this site to a state significance level as opposed to a site that meets needs identified for the local community?

*The Action Agenda can be found at www.psp.wa.gov.

**Evaluators are instructed to ignore this question for projects outside Water Resource Inventory Areas 1-19.

ATTACHMENT C: PROPOSED FUNDING PREFERENCE PLACEHOLDER LANGUAGE

Staff proposes inserting the following language into criteria sections of the following:

- Manual 21 (ALEA),
- Manual 10a (WWRP: Outdoor Recreation Account),
- Manual 10b (WWRP: Habitat Conservation Account and Riparian Protection Account), and
- 10f (WWRP: Farmland Preservation Program).

Is the project sponsored by an entity that is a Puget Sound partner, as defined in RCW 90.71.010?*

*This criterion will apply only to projects within Water Resource Inventory Areas 1-19. This determination will be made on or before the project evaluation, not at some later date. When the Puget Sound Partnership determines a method for designating Puget Sound partners, the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board will modify relevant policies. Policies will be designed to prevent less preferential funding treatment to sponsors not eligible to be Puget Sound partners.

ATTACHMENT D: SUMMARIZED PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED POLICIES

Commenter	Comments ¹	Staff Response
Peter Mayer, Vancouver- Clark Parks and Recreation, Washington Recreation and Park Association	<p>It seems premature and somewhat arbitrary to invoke preferential strategies, incentives and disincentives on a specific basin without understanding the basin's status relative to the condition of other ecosystems in the state. Washington's Biodiversity Conservation Strategy urges the utilization of the Conservation Opportunity Framework to classify lands based on their biodiversity significance and the risks from growth and development. I urge that this analysis be completed BEFORE a specific basin is targeted to receive preferential treatment.</p> <p>Statutory language appears to not address whether a project potentially "in conflict" with the PSP Action Agenda could be adequately mitigated to not be "in conflict" and thus be eligible. I urge further clarification.</p> <p>The PSP has not yet defined how eligible organizations residing in Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIA's) 1-19 might become partners. ... More explicit criteria must first be developed ... as the subjectivity of the [statutory] definition may lead to inconsistent interpretations in a critical funding preference situation.</p> <p>The statutory language concerning the three issues above has not been consistently applied across all grant programs and the PSP's fiscal accountability legislation makes inconsistent references to RCO programs. Greater clarity regarding statutory requirements, legislative intent and program compatibilities is needed before broadly implementing alignment initiatives. I suggest that ONLY ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account be pilot tested for ONLY one grant funding cycle with issue #1 and #2 applied.</p>	<p>RCO staff and the stakeholder group agree that the statutory language is complex, and in some cases, unclear. Stakeholders believe that the proposed processes seem to be the best option at this time.</p> <p>Staff has recommended that the board add placeholder language to the ALEA and WWRP policies noting that the board will adopt policies for giving preferential treatment to partners after a method is determined for designating Puget Sound partners.</p> <p>Recommendations #1 and #2 apply only to ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account.</p>

¹ In some cases, the remarks have been edited for brevity.

Commenter	Comments ¹	Staff Response
Jim Aldrich, Friends of the Fields	<p>1) The criteria for determining if projects are "in conflict" with the Puget Sound Action Agenda need to be established to minimize subjectivity in making such determinations. It is very important the criteria be unambiguous and clearly defined.</p> <p>2) The criteria for determining if projects are "consistent" with the Puget Sound Action Agenda need to be established to minimize subjectivity in making such determinations</p> <p>3) Equitable execution of the "Puget Sound partner" requirement will be difficult to achieve. Any procedure/method developed to implement this must be validated to ensure a good project isn't negatively impacted by it.</p> <p>4) The criteria, used to determine if "affected projects" within Areas 1-19 follow the 3 priorities of the Partnership, must be well defined to minimize subjectivity in making such determinations.</p> <p>Thus, the main concern is that all criteria used to evaluate/assess projects must be straightforward and clearly defined.</p>	<p>Staff and stakeholders are proposing a process by which the RCO, the project sponsor, and the Partnership would work together to determine if projects are in conflict or consistent with the Action Agenda. The hope is that the experience will help us to develop criteria in the future.</p> <p>Staff has recommended that the board add placeholder language to the ALEA and WWRP policies noting that the board will adopt policies for giving preferential treatment to partners after a method is determined for designating Puget Sound partners. Any methods to implement the requirement will be tested by RCO staff before application in a grant cycle.</p>
Sharon Claussen, King County Parks and Recreation	<p>Number 1 should be strictly interpreted to include Puget Sound <u>restoration</u> projects only.</p> <p>Number 2 should not be applied to the WWRP Outdoor Recreation grant account. The types of projects historically funded in this category; local parks, trails and water access are not elements that have nexus to the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda and would not be found referenced in the agenda.</p> <p>Number 3, giving preference to partners, should remain on hold until there is a process developed for identifying partners along with ample time for agencies to comply and adapt their projects to this new requirement.</p> <p>The stakeholder discussion also brought forth the concerns that there are no identified "state approved protocols" <i>and this language should not be used unless or until these protocols are developed and approved.</i></p>	<p>Recommendation 1 applies only to projects that address the restoration of Puget Sound.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 applies only to ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account.</p> <p>Staff has recommended that the board add placeholder language to the ALEA and WWRP policies noting that the board will adopt policies for giving preferential treatment to partners after a method is determined for designating Puget Sound partners.</p> <p>This language is not in the self-certification letter.</p>

Commenter	Comments ¹	Staff Response
James Cahill, Puget Sound Partnership	<p>We would ask that you add a sentence to Proposal #2 regarding projects funded by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board as follows: "Projects on three-year work plans will qualify as they are referenced under Near Term Action B.1.1 (page 42) of the Action Agenda."</p> <p>The other changes proposed by RCO in other parts of your letter seem to be the best option at this time.</p>	Staff will address this comment with the SRFB.
Jack Wilson, Metro Parks Tacoma	<p>...The proposed policy changes ... appear to either prohibit or give a significant funding disadvantage to parks and recreation projects that are essential to the social, economic and environmental well being of our community.</p> <p>Metro Parks Tacoma like many other public organizations has taken many steps to change our practices to reduce the negative environmental impacts of our operations and facilities, and to enhance our natural world....</p> <p>We hope that the RCO policies strike a balance so that grant funding can continue to help communities such as Tacoma keep our families and children active, while also improving the health of Puget Sound.....</p>	Recommendations #1 and #2 apply only to ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account and do not affect the Outdoor Recreation Account, Local Parks Category.
Bob Lynette, R. Lynette and Associates Renewable Energy Consultants	<p>I believe that the requesting party for <u>all</u> grant programs administered by RCO should be required to certify that they are not in conflict with the Puget Sound Partnership's Action Agenda.</p> <p>Such certifications should not be restricted to only those grants that are aimed at restoration, but should include all new projects that could adversely impact Puget Sound.</p>	<p>In keeping with the legislation, recommendations #1 and #2 apply only to ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account.</p> <p>Recommendation 1 applies only to projects that address the restoration of Puget Sound.</p>
Theresa Julius, Grays Harbor Council of Governments	The phrase: "Give funding preference to Puget Sound partners without giving less preferential treatment to entities that are not eligible to be Puget Sound partners." makes me concerned for projects that are not in Puget Sound.	Any methods to implement the requirement will be tested by RCO staff before application in a grant cycle to avoid unintended consequences.

Commenter	Comments ¹	Staff Response
Joanna Grist, Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program	<p>We believe that the first two staff recommendations should be approved so long as it is clear that they apply only to projects within the Habitat Conservation Account and are in the Puget Sound geographic region. We do not believe that the third proposal has had sufficient work to be approved. The definition by the Puget Sound Partnership of what constitutes a “partner” remains. <i>(Staff note: a follow up telephone call to WWRC clarified that the WWRC supports the third proposal as drafted but recommends further stakeholder outreach on the issue.)</i></p> <p>In addition, we believe that there are some principals related to the WWRP that should not be violated:</p> <p>The geographic distribution of funding should not be unbalanced in favor of projects in the Puget Sound geographic region Allocation of funding among WWRP categories should not be affected Any changes should be consistent with current WWRP statutes</p>	<p>Recommendations #1 and #2 apply only to ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account and do not affect the Outdoor Recreation Account, Local Parks Category.</p> <p>Staff has recommended that the board add placeholder language to the ALEA and WWRP policies noting that the board will adopt policies for giving preferential treatment to partners after a method is determined for designating Puget Sound partners. Any methods to implement the requirement will be tested by RCO staff before application in a grant cycle to avoid unintended consequences.</p>
Sandra Staples-Bortner, Great Peninsula Conservancy	<p>Proposal #1: Great Peninsula Conservancy supports the self-certification approach recommended here. We believe this will simply and accurately address the legislative mandate.</p> <p>Proposal #2: Our concern here is that very few projects are specifically referenced by name in the Action Agenda. We support an approach that takes a broad look at this guideline.</p> <p>Proposal #3: Because the Puget Sound Partnership has not yet determined a method for designating Puget Sound partners, it is difficult to evaluate this proposal. The interim language recommended for inclusion seems to satisfy the need for now.</p>	

Commenter	Comments ¹	Staff Response
Leslie Betlach, City of Renton	<p>It is unclear what the relative status of the Puget Sound Basin is in comparison to other basins throughout the state. It is also unclear how the Puget Sound Partnership preferential strategies, incentives, and disincentives applied to a specific basin will affect other basins relative to statewide ecosystems.</p> <p>The Puget Sound Partnership has not yet defined how eligible organizations become partners. The subjectivity of the current definition in RCW 90.71.010(12) may lead to inconsistent interpretations, which could be critical if used as a funding preference. Criteria articulating “consistency” and “outstanding progress” needs to be developed providing clear objectives for entities interested in becoming partners.</p> <p>The Partnership has not yet defined how entities can incorporate new projects to be included as part of the Action Agenda. Further clarification is needed.</p> <p>Statutory language does not address whether a project “in conflict” with the Action Agenda has the opportunity to be mitigated so as not to be “in conflict,” and therefore eligible. Further clarification is needed.</p> <p>I also recommend that only the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) Program, the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) Program, and the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) Habitat Conservation Account (not the <u>Outdoor Recreation Account</u>) be considered for policy revisions with a trial running through for one grant funding cycle. Following completion of the funding cycle, an evaluation using the predetermined criteria to determine effectiveness of the revised policy language should occur.</p>	<p>Staff has recommended that the board add placeholder language to the ALEA and WWRP policies noting that the board will adopt policies for giving preferential treatment to partners after a method is determined for designating Puget Sound partners. Any methods to implement the requirement will be tested by RCO staff before application in a grant cycle to avoid unintended consequences.</p> <p>Staff and stakeholders are proposing a process by which the RCO, the project sponsor, and the Partnership would work together to determine if projects are in conflict or consistent with the Action Agenda. The hope is that the experience will help us to develop criteria in the future.</p> <p>Recommendations #1 and #2 apply only to ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account and do not affect the Outdoor Recreation Account, Local Parks Category.</p>
Jennifer Schroder, Kirkland Parks and Community Services	<p>I support the purpose of the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda (PSPAA) but I do not agree with the proposal to apply the Agenda’s criteria to the WWRP Local Parks account. Applying the proposed criteria would eliminate and/or reduce communities outside of the Puget Sound Basin from being competitive and we will see less funding for traditional parks.</p> <p>I support inclusion of ALEA, SRFB and the Habitat Conservation Account (<u>only</u>) of the Habitat Conservation and Outdoor Recreation Lands under WWRP. These grant accounts are a logical match to support the PSPAA, Local Parks account is not.</p>	<p>Recommendations #1 and #2 apply only to ALEA, the Salmon Recovery Program, and the WWRP Habitat Conservation Account and do not affect the Outdoor Recreation Account, Local Parks Category.</p>