Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program – Water Access Evaluation Criteria

The 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan and Recreation and Conservation Funding Board Unifying Strategy establishes priorities for funding outdoor recreation in Washington State. This evaluation instrument incorporates the plan's priorities identified specifically for the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program (WWRP) to address underserved populations and health improvements.

Below are the changes to the evaluation instrument to reflect the 2018-2022 Unifying Strategy. These changes are incorporated into the evaluation criteria starting in the 2018 grant round.

- Add specific instructions on how to reply to criteria #1 "Public Need".
    - This change identifies the types of underserved populations and health indicators where the project is located.
- Remove criteria #2 "SCORP Priorities".
    - This question is replaced by the addition to criteria #1.

PROPOSED WWRP Water Access Criteria Summary					
Score	**#**	**Question**	**Project Type**	**Maximum Points Possible**	**Focus**
Advisory Committee	1	Public Need	All	15	Local
~~Advisory Committee~~	~~2~~	~~SCORP Priorities~~	~~All~~	~~5~~	~~State~~
Advisory Committee	~~3~~2	Immediacy of Threat	Acquisition	15	Local
			Combination	7.5	
Advisory Committee	~~4~~3	Project Design	Development	10	Technical
			Combination	5	
Advisory Committee	~~5~~4	Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship	All	10	State
Advisory Committee	~~6~~5	Site Suitability	All	10	Technical
Advisory Committee	~~7~~6	Expansion	All	5	State
Advisory Committee	~~8~~7	Diversity of Recreational Uses	Development	5	State
			Combination	2.5	
Advisory Committee	~~9~~8	Project Support	All	10	State, Local
Advisory Committee	~~10~~9	Cost Efficiencies	All	5	State, Local
RCO Staff	~~11~~10	Growth Management Act Preference	All	0	State
RCO Staff	~~12~~11	Population Proximity	All	3	State
Total Points Possible=~~78~~ 73					

*Focus: Criteria orientation in accordance with the following priorities:

- State–those that meet general statewide needs (often called for in Revised Codes of Washington or the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan [SCORP])
- Local–those that meet local needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans)
- Technical–those that meet technical considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

Detailed Scoring Criteria: Water Access

Advisory Committee Scored

1. **Public Need**. Considering the availability of existing public water access sites within at least 15 miles of the project site, what is the need for additional such sites[1] and how will this project address the priorities for underserved populations and health recommendations in the 2018-2022 Recreation and Conservation Plan?

   Establish the water access need by inventorying all available water access 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 local, regional, or statewide recreational or resource plan *and* if the project assists in implementation of a local shoreline master program, updated according to Revised Code of Washington 90.58.080 or local comprehensive plans updated according to Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.130.

   To assist you in answering the questions about underserved populations and health recommendations, locate your project on the Grant Application Data Tool to determine whether your project is in a census tract in which one or more of the populations listed below are present. You also may provide more specific data about the demographics and health conditions of the population within the service area of the proposed project.

   Demographic Measures for Underserved Populations
   - The median household income level in the census tract where the project is located is below the median statewide household income level ($62,108 as of 2015)
   - Based on percentage, there are more people of color in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (30 percent as of 2015)
   - Based on percentage, there are more people with a disability in the census tract where the project is located than the statewide percentage (13 percent as of 2015)

   Opportunities for Health Improvements
   - The body mass index for ages 16-19 in the census tract where the project is located is higher than the statewide body mass index (22.94 as of 2015)
   - The mortality rate in the census tract where the project is located is higher than the statewide mortality rate (692 as of 2015)

   ▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3.

   ~~Revised April 18, 2006~~ Revised October 2017.

[1] Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(b)(v-vi)

~~**2. SCORP Priorities.** How will this project address statewide or regional priorities as described in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan?~~

- ~~How will this project specifically provide a diversity of recreation opportunities that meet the needs of the state's underserved populations which are:~~
  - ~~People with disabilities~~
  - ~~People of color~~
  - ~~Residents over 46 years old~~
  - ~~Women~~
- ~~How will this project help increase physical activities among people of all ages and abilities or low income and diverse communities?~~
- ~~Will this project support federal, state, regional, or local health initiatives such as:~~
  - ~~National Physical Activity Plan~~
  - ~~Healthy Communities Washington from the Washington Department of Health~~
  - ~~Local Community Health Assessment or Local Community Health Improvement Plan~~
  - ~~Health Impact Assessments from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and Pew Charitable Trust~~

~~▲ Point Range: 0-5.~~

~~Adopted February 2016~~

~~3.~~2. **Immediacy of Threat.** To what extent will this project reduce a threat to the public availability of water access?(acquisition and combination projects only)[2]

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

▲ Point Range below. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 3 for acquisition projects and 1.5 for combination projects.

0 points No evidence presented.

[2]Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(b)(iii)

1-2 points	*Minimal threat*; water access opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use *in the next 36 months.*
3 points	Actions under consideration *could* result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use.
4-5 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 that has led a *land trust* to acquire rights in the land at the request of the applicant agency.

Revised May 7, 2003

~~4.~~3. Project Design. Does the project demonstrate good design criteria; does it make the best use of the site?(development and combination projects only)

Measures 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:

Accuracy of Cost Estimates	Recreation Experiences
Aesthetics	Risk management
Maintenance	Space relationships
Materials	User friendly and barrier-free
Phasing	

When considering renovation projects, a proposal to restore an underused site to its original intended capacity could score higher if the renovation will correct problems that are due to circumstances beyond the control of the sponsor (i.e. natural disaster, reached life expectancy, etc.) and are not associated with inadequate maintenance of the facility.

- Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2 for development projects.

Revised April 18, 2006

~~5.~~4. Sustainability and Environmental Stewardship. Will the project result in a quality, sustainable, recreational opportunity while protecting the integrity of the environment?

Factors to consider for acquisition and/or development and renovation projects are outlined in the table below.

Acquisition	Development and Renovation
• Does the acquisition and proposed development preserve the natural function of the site?	• Does the proposed development protect natural resources onsite and integrate sustainable elements such as low impact development techniques, green infrastructure, or environmentally preferred building products?
• How do the proposed uses protect, enhance or restore the ecosystem functions of the property?	
• Are there invasive species on site? If there are, what is your response plan?	• Vegetation/Surfaces – Are you replacing invasive plant species with native vegetation? Are you using pervious surfaces for any of the proposed facilities?
• What is the strategy or plan for maintenance and stewardship of the site?	• Education – Are you installing interpretive panels/signs that educate users about sustainability?
• How do the natural characteristics of the site support future planned uses?	• Materials – What sustainable materials are included in the project?
• To provide for greater fuel economy, is the proposed acquisition located close to the intended users?	• Energy – What energy efficient features are you adding?
• What modes of transportation provide access to the site?	• What modes of transportation provide access to the site?
• Does this project protect wetlands or wetland functions? Describe the size, quality, and classification.	• Water – Is the on-site storm water managed by rain gardens, porous paving, or other sustainable features? Does the design exceed permit requirements for storm water management?
• How does the proposed acquisition help create connectivity? How many acres are already protected? How critical is this property to the overall plan?	• If there are wetlands on site, describe the size, quality and classification and explain how the design considers the wetland functions.
• What other noteworthy characteristics demonstrate how the natural features of the site contribute to energy efficiency, less maintenance, fewer environmental impacts, or sustainability?	• What is the strategy or plan for long-term maintenance and stewardship of the site?
	• What other developed features will contribute to increasing energy efficiencies, reducing maintenance,

Acquisition	Development and Renovation
	minimizing environmental impacts, or being more sustainable?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

Adopted January 2014.

~~6.~~5. **Site Suitability.** Is the site well suited for the intended recreational uses?[3]

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

- **Acquisition projects.** Is the site to be acquired well suited for the intended recreational uses?

  or

- **Development projects.** Will site resources be made available appropriately for recreation; will environmental or other important values be protected by the proposed development?

  or

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

▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

Revised May 7, 2003

~~7.~~6. **Expansion.** Will the project expand an existing recreation area or facility?

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

[3]Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(b)(v)

▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points.

~~8.~~7. **Diversity of Recreational Uses.** To what extent does this project provide diversity of possible water-based recreational activities? (development and combination projects only)[4]

Water access can provide the opportunity for a variety of recreational uses including swimming, fishing, boating, picnicking, viewing, and shellfish gathering. In general, projects providing more *compatible* recreation uses will score better than projects providing just one type of water access opportunity.

▲ Point Range: 0-5. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points. Scores for combination projects are multiplied later by 0.5.

Revised May 7, 2003

~~9.~~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.[5]

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 and friends groups.
  - Media coverage.
- The extent to which the public was involved in a comprehensive planning process that includes this project.

▲ Point Range below. Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are multiplied later by 2.

[4]Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(b)(iv)
[5] Revised Code of Washington 79A.15.070(6)(b)(i)

0 points	No evidence presented.
1-2 points	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.
3 points	Adequate support.
4-5 points	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.

Revised May 7, 2003

~~10.~~9. **Cost Efficiencies.** To what extent does this project demonstrate efficiencies or a reduction in government costs through documented use of donations or other resources?

Donations – cash, real property, volunteer labor, equipment use, or materials

- What are the donations for this project?
- Who is making the donations?
- What are the values of the donations and how were the values determined?
- Are the donations in hand?
- If the donation are not in hand, do you have a letter of commitment from the donors that specifies what is being donated and when?
- Are the donations necessary for implementation of the project? Are donations included in the project proposal?

Private grants awarded by non-governmental organizations

- Is there a private grant that is being used as match for this project?
- Who awarded the grant?
- What is the grant amount?
- What is the purpose of the grant?
- When will grant funds be available?

Are there other efficiencies for this project that will result in cost savings?

- What is the cost efficiency?
- Who is providing it?
- What's the value?
- When was the commitment made and when does it expire?

▲ Point Range: Evaluators award 0-5 points.

Revised February 2016.

RCO Staff Scores—Applicants Do Not Answer in Evaluation Session

~~11.~~10. **Growth Management Act Preference.** Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act?[6]

State law requires that:

A. Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the applicant[7] has adopted a comprehensive plan and development regulations as required by Revised Code of Washington 36.70A.040.

B. When reviewing such requests, the state agency shall accord additional preference to applicants that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant is deemed to have satisfied the requirements for adopting a comprehensive plan and development regulations if it:

   - Adopts or has adopted within the time periods specified in state law;
   - Adopts or has adopted by the time it requests a grant or loan; or
   - Demonstrates substantial progress toward adopting within the time periods specified in state law. An agency that is more than 6 months out of compliance with the time periods has not demonstrated substantial progress.

C. A request from an applicant planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (B) over a request from an applicant

[6]Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250 (Growth Management Act-preference required.)
[7]County, city, or town applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to state agency or tribal government applicants.

not planning under this state law.

This question is scored by RCO staff based on information obtained from the state Department of Commerce, Growth Management Division. Scoring occurs after RCO's technical completion deadline. If an agency's comprehensive plan, development regulation, or amendment has been appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board, the agency cannot be penalized during the period of appeal.

▲ Point Range below. RCO staff subtracts a maximum of 1 point. There is no multiplier.

Minus 1 point	The applicant does not meet the requirements of Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250.
0 points	The applicant meets the requirements of Revised Code of Washington 43.17.250.
0 points	The applicant is a nonprofit organization or state or federal agency.

Revised January 2014

~~12.~~11. Population Proximity. Is the project in a populated area?[8]

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.

▲ Point Range below. The result from "A" is added to the result from "B." Projects in cities with a population more than 5,000 *and* within high density counties receive points from both "A" and "B." RCO staff awards a maximum of 3 points.

A. The project is within the urban growth 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

Revised November 2007

[8]Revised Code of Washington 79A.25.250