Jefferson County Conservation Futures Committee

Special Meeting, Wednesday April 30, 2014 2:00-4:00 PM
JCPH Pacific Room
Port Townsend, WA
DRAFT MINUTES

* Decisions and action items are indicated in bold font.

Members Present: Phil Andrus, District 2; Scott Brinton – Agriculture; Lige Christian, District 3; JD Gallant – District 3; Ray Hunter, Interest – Fallow Farms; Richard Jahnke, Interest – Coastal Areas; Janet Kearsley, Vice-Chair, District 1; Lorna Smith, Chair, Interest – Ecotourism; Jerry Gorsline, District 2; Rob Harbour, Interest – Working Lands; Craig Schrader, Interest – Climate Change

Members Absent: Sarah Spaeth, Interest - Jefferson Land Trust (excused)

County Staff Present: Tami Pokorny, Water Quality Division; Betsy Carlson, recorder

Guests: Veronica Shaw, deputy director Jefferson County Public Health

I. Call to Order:

Chair Lorna Smith called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the April 16, 2014 meeting were approved as written.

III. Review of Agenda:

A special thank you was given to the past Chair, Richard Jahnke, for his service.

IV. Observer comments:

Tami Pokorny told the group that the amount of funding available to new projects in this round was, in actuality, far below the previously estimated amount ($42,000 rather than $115,000).

Veronica Shaw suggested that the problem came from there being three parts to the Tarboo Forest Conservation project in the county financial accounting and one year’s award value was accidentally left out of the calculation. She apologized for this problem. Tami Pokorny also took responsibility for the error.
Adjustment to the agenda was discussed in light of this new development. **Phil Andrus moved to amend agenda to allow an opportunity to discuss the situation and next steps. Members agreed.**

Lorna Smith reported that she has had a conversation with Sarah Spaeth earlier in the day. Sarah Spaeth told her that the funding situation puts the Jefferson Land Trust in a very difficult situation, and she hoped that the committee would recommend that the BoCC give the Land Trust maximum flexibility [in allocating funding between projects] depending on how circumstances with landowners and other funders evolve in coming weeks. Discussion followed.

V. **Old Business:**

None

VI. **New Business**

A. Ethic Questions and Responses (Article III of By-Laws)

Tami Pokorny read the following deposition statement, with regard to the two conservation futures applications: 2014 Quimper Wildlife Corridor/Jefferson Land Trust and Snow Creek Watershed Acquisitions/Jefferson Land Trust

In order to obtain and maintain the appearance of fairness in this decision-making process, the Committee wishes to know if there is anyone in the audience who objects to the participation of any particular Committee member in this decision-making process, and, if so, to state the reasons for that objection.

No one voiced any objection.

First Project
Staff then stated that she would read the four questions in relation to the 2014 Quimper Wildlife Corridor/Jefferson Land Trust project for each member to answer in turn.

*Do you as a member of the committee stand to gain or lose any financial benefit as a result of the outcome of this hearing?*

Janet Kearsley: No
Ray Hunter: No
Gerry Gorsline: No
Scott Brinton: No
JD Gallant: No
Rob Harbour: No

Phil Andrus: No
Lige Christian: No
Craig Schrader: No
Rick Jahnke: No
Lorna Smith: No
Are you as a committee member able to hear and consider this proposal or application in a fair and objective manner, that is, without bias and without a predisposition toward any particular result regarding this proposal or application?

Janet Kearsley: yes
Ray Hunter: yes
Gerry Gorsline: yes
Scott Brinton: yes
JD Gallant: yes
Rob Harbour: yes
Phil Andrus: yes
Lige Christian: yes
Craig Schrader: yes
Rick Jahnke: yes
Lorna Smith: yes

Have you as a committee member engaged in any communication outside this hearing with either a proponent or opponent of this particular proposal or application?

Janet Kearsley: No
Ray Hunter: I emailed Phyllis Schultz to say “things are looking good”
Gerry Gorsline: No
Scott Brinton: No
JD Gallant: No
Rob Harbour: No
Phil Andrus: No
Lige Christian: No
Craig Schrader: No
Rick Jahnke: No
Lorna Smith: I have as noted previously, I discussed the situation with Sarah.

Are you as a committee member able to certify that you have attended the project presentation and either attended the site visit or viewed the official video tape?

Janet Kearsley: yes
Ray Hunter: yes
Gerry Gorsline: yes
Scott Brinton: yes
JD Gallant: yes
Rob Harbour: yes
Phil Andrus: yes
Lige Christian: yes
Craig Schrader: yes
Rick Jahnke: yes
Lorna Smith: yes

Second Project
Staff then read the four questions in relation to the Snow Creek Watershed Acquisitions/Jefferson Land Trust project for each member to answer in turn.

Do you as a member of the committee stand to gain or lose any financial benefit as a result of the outcome of this hearing?

Janet Kearsley: No
Ray Hunter: No
Gerry Gorsline: No
Scott Brinton: No
JD Gallant: No
Rob Harbour: No
Phil Andrus: No
Lige Christian: No
Craig Schrader: No            Lorna Smith: No
Rick Jahnke: No

*Are you as a committee member able to hear and consider this proposal or application in a fair and objective manner, that is, without bias and without a predisposition toward any particular result regarding this proposal or application?*

Janet Kearsley: yes          Phil Andrus: yes
Ray Hunter: yes             Lige Christian: yes
Gerry Gorsline: yes         Craig Schrader: yes
Scott Brinton: yes          Rick Jahnke: yes
JD Gallant: yes             Lorna Smith: yes
Rob Harbour: yes

*Have you as a committee member engaged in any communication outside this hearing with either a proponent or opponent of this particular proposal or application?*

Janet Kearsley: No          Phil Andrus: No
Ray Hunter: No              Lige Christian: No
Gerry Gorsline: No          Craig Schrader: No
Scott Brinton: No           Rick Jahnke: No
JD Gallant: No              Lorna Smith: Yes with Sarah Spaeth as formerly disclosed
Rob Harbour: No

*Are you as a committee member able to certify that you have attended the project presentation and either attended the site visit or viewed the official video tape?*

Janet Kearsley: yes          Phil Andrus: yes
Ray Hunter: yes             Lige Christian: yes
Gerry Gorsline: yes         Craig Schrader: yes
Scott Brinton: yes          Rick Jahnke: yes
JD Gallant: yes             Lorna Smith: yes
Rob Harbour: yes

Review Ranking Results

2:30 A brief break was taken while a committee member completed the score sheets.  
2:36 Chair Smith reconvened the meeting with a review of the projects.

Discussion and Rating of 2014 Conservation Futures project applications

1. **2014 Quimper Wildlife Corridor/Jefferson Land Trust** Rating Process
Committee members took turns reading questions from the ratings sheet. Scores for each question were compared, discussed and adjusted as desired. Final scores are reflected in the composite spreadsheet for each project in Appendix A.

**Question #1**  
To what degree does the project leverage contributions for acquisition from groups, agencies or individuals?  
   a. leverages significantly = 3 points  
   b. leverages moderately = 2 points  
   c. meets requirement = 1 point

Lige Christian – score should be a 2 and not a 4  
No discussion

**Question #2**  
To what degree does the project sponsor commit to provide long-term stewardship for the proposed project?  
   a. Stewardship plan with guaranteed long-term stewardship = 5 points  
   b. Stewardship plan with guaranteed short-term stewardship = 3 points  
   c. Stewardship plan, no guarantee = 1 point

All in agreement – all 5s.

**Question #3**  
To what degree has the project sponsor demonstrated effective long-term stewardship of a similar project?  
   a. Highly demonstrated = 5 points  
   b. Moderately demonstrated = 3 points  
   c. Slightly demonstrated = 1 point  
   d. Effectiveness not demonstrated = 0 points

Scores for this question were in agreement.

**Question #4**  
To what degree is the acquisition feasible?  
   a. Highly feasible = 5 points  
   b. Moderately feasible = 3 points  
   c. Slightly feasible = 1 point

Lige Christian – change 4 to a 3  
Committee members ranking ranged from 3 - 5

Discussion as to what defines “feasible” – each member uses what they are comfortable with.
**Question #5**
To what degree is the project part of an adopted open space, conservation, or resource preservation program or plan, or identified in a community conservation effort?
- a. Site identified in the adopted plan = 5 points
- b. Site is not identified in the adopted plan, but the project complements an adopted plan = 3 points
- c. Stand alone project with an adopted plan and potential to stimulate broader conservation efforts = 1 point

Committee members ranking ranged from 4 - 5

**Question #6**
To what degree does the project conserve opportunities which are otherwise lost or threatened?
- a. Significantly threatened = 5 points
- b. Moderately threatened = 3 points
- c. Slightly threatened = 1 point
- d. Not threatened = 0 points

Committee members ranking ranged from 3 – 5

**Question #7**
To what degree does the project preserve habitat for flora and fauna?
- a. State of Washington Priority Habitat and/or State or Federal Endangered, Threatened or Sensitive species = 0–3 points
  
  Lige Christian – requested change his ranking to a 2

- b. Variety of native flora & fauna = 0–3 points
  No adjustments to scores

- c. Provides wildlife corridor or migration route = 0–3 points
  No adjustments to scores

**Question #8**
To what degree does the project preserve farmland for agricultural use?
- a. Participates in other conservation programs = 0–3 points

- b. Likely will maintain active agricultural use = 0–3 points
  Lorna Smith would like to change 8b. to 0

- c. Preserves rural cultural heritage = 0–3 points
  Ray Hunger and Lorna Smith would like to change 8c. to 0

- d. Other programs
Question #9
To what degree does the project serve a significant benefit area?
   a. Broad county benefit = 5 points
   b. Localized benefit = 3 points

No adjustments to scores

Question #10
To what degree does the acquisition provide educational opportunities, interpretive opportunities, and/or serve as a general community resource?
   a. Public access, with planned or educational/interpretive displays and materials, events or activities = 5 points
   b. Limited public access, available space for signage and educational materials = 3 points
   c. Remote location = 1 point
   d. No opportunity = 0 points

Craig Schrader – changed from a 4 to a 3

Question #11
To what degree does the project preserve historic or culturally significant resources?\(^1\)
   a. Project is registered with the National Register of Historic Places, or an equivalent program = 3 points
   b. Project is recognized locally as having historic or cultural resources = 2 points
   c. Project is adjacent to and provides a buffer for a historic or cultural site = 1 point

Discussion: The project is part of the Cappy’s Trails area which some of the members recognize as cultural resource.

Question #12
To what degree does the project preserve forestland for silvicultural use?
   a. Management plan retains or establishes a mix of species and age class = 0-3 points
   b. Land is enrolled in public and/or private programs which certify long-term sustainable silviculture Certified = 3 points Uncertified = 0 points
   c. Participates in other conservation or restoration programs = 0 – 3 points

Ray Hunter – change 12a. from 3 to 0, and 12b. from 3 to 0

---

\(^1\) Cultural resources means archeological and historic sites and artifacts, and traditional religious ceremonial and social uses and activities of affected Indian Tribes and mandatory protections of resources under chapters 27.44 and 27.53 RCW.

http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us

Conservation Futures - April 30, 2014
Lorna Smith and Ray Hunter – change 12c. from 3 to 0

Discussion: The committee considers the term of “silviculture” to mean management of trees for the purpose of harvest.
Request for future agenda – a list of definitions of the terms used be added to the handbook. Also be sure the definition sheet goes to the applicants.

Average score = 232.

2. **Snow Creek Watershed Acquisitions/Jefferson Land Trust Rating Process**

**Question #1**
*To what degree does the project leverage contributions for acquisition from groups, agencies or individuals?*
- a. leverages significantly = 3 points
- b. leverages moderately = 2 points
- c. meets requirement = 1 point

Lige Christian – change to 3

**Question #2**
*To what degree does the project sponsor commit to provide long-term stewardship for the proposed project?*
- a. Stewardship plan with guaranteed long-term stewardship = 5 points
- b. Stewardship plan with guaranteed short-term stewardship = 3 points
- c. Stewardship plan, no guarantee = 1 point

Scores were in agreement, all 5s

**Question #3**
*To what degree has the project sponsor demonstrated effective long-term stewardship of a similar project?*
- a. Highly demonstrated = 5 points
- b. Moderately demonstrated = 3 points
- c. Slightly demonstrated = 1 point
- d. Effectiveness not demonstrated = 0 points

Ray Hunter – change from 3 to 5

**Question #4**
*To what degree is the acquisition feasible?*
- a. Highly feasible = 5 points
- b. Moderately feasible = 3 points
- c. Slightly feasible = 1 point
Craig Schrader – change to 3

Question #5
To what degree is the project part of an adopted open space, conservation, or resource preservation program or plan, or identified in a community conservation effort?
   a. Site identified in the adopted plan = 5 points
   b. Site is not identified in the adopted plan, but the project complements an adopted plan = 3 points
   c. Stand alone project with an adopted plan and potential to stimulate broader conservation efforts = 1 point

No score changes made

Question #6
To what degree does the project conserve opportunities which are otherwise lost or threatened?
   a. Significantly threatened = 5 points
   b. Moderately threatened = 3 points
   c. Slightly threatened = 1 point
   d. Not threatened = 0 points

There was no discussion.

Question #7
To what degree does the project preserve habitat for flora and fauna?
   a. State of Washington Priority Habitat and/or State or Federal Endangered,
      Threatened or Sensitive species = 0–3 points
      All in agreement, No change
   b. Variety of native flora & fauna = 0–3 points
      No change
   c. Provides wildlife corridor or migration route = 0–3 points

Craig Schrader – change to a 3; All 3s

Question #8
To what degree does the project preserve farmland for agricultural use?
   a. Participates in other conservation programs = 0–3 points
   b. Likely will maintain active agricultural use = 0–3 points
   c. Preserves rural cultural heritage = 0–3 points
   d. Other Programs
Ray Hunter changed b. to 0 and Lorna Smith changed c. to 0

**Question #9**
To what degree does the project serve a significant benefit area?

- a. Broad county benefit = 5 points
- b. Localized benefit = 3 points

Rick Jahnke would like to change from 2 to 5

**Question #10**
To what degree does the acquisition provide educational opportunities, interpretive opportunities, and/or serve as a general community resource?

- a. Public access, with planned or educational/interpretive displays and materials, events or activities = 5 points
- b. Limited public access, available space for signage and educational materials = 3 points
- c. Remote location = 1 point
- d. No opportunity = 0 points

Discussion: Access to this property would be through guided groups as limited public access.

**Question #11**
To what degree does the project preserve historic or culturally significant resources?

- a. Project is registered with the National Register of Historic Places, or an equivalent program = 3 points
- b. Project is recognized locally as having historic or cultural resources = 2 points
- c. Project is adjacent to and provides a buffer for a historic or cultural site = 1 point

Ray Hunter, Phil Andrus and JD Gallant – change to a 2

**Question #12**
To what degree does the project preserve forestland for silvicultural use?

- a. Management plan retains or establishes a mix of species and age class = 0-3 points

Lorna Smith, Ray Hunter and Craig Schrader – change 12a. to 0

---

2 Cultural resources means archeological and historic sites and artifacts, and traditional religious ceremonial and social uses and activities of affected Indian Tribes and mandatory protections of resources under chapters 27.44 and 27.53 RCW.

[http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us)
b. **Land is enrolled in public and/or private programs which certify long-term sustainable silviculture**  
   Certified = 3 points  Uncertified = 0 points  
   Ray Hunter – Change 12b. to 0  

c. **Participates in other conservation or restoration programs = 0 – 3 points**  
   Scott Brinton – Change 12c. to 0  
   Lorna Smith – Change 12c. to 0  

Snow Creek Watershed Acquisitions/Jefferson Land Trust Average score = 241  

**Project Ranking Scores**  
Quimper Wildlife = 232  
Snow Creek = 241  

Phil Andrus moves that Snow Creek is worthy of funding. Rick Jahnke seconded. All in favor, motion carries.  

Lige Christian moved that the Quimper Wildlife Corridor is worthy of funding. Scott Brinton seconded. Discussion followed. All in favor, motion carries.  

**Discussion regarding recommendations to Board of County Commissioners (BoCC)**  
Phil Andrus moved: That we recommend that the committee pass to the BoCC, that both projects are worthy of funding and we share the ranking with the BoCC and make no recommendation as to funding priority. Seconded by Rob Harbour.  
Maker of motion accepts friendly amendment: That the funds be spent this year. Second friendly amendment: That the BoCC work with the applicants as to the feasibility between the two projects as to where the funds will be expended.  

**Motion results:** One opposed; all the rest is in favor.  

**Discussion:**  
Phil Andrus made a motion that there is a full report given [to the CF Committee] in writing of what happened here. Second part of the motion is that there should be a full accounting of the budget submitted quarterly by staff to the committee. Ray Hunter seconded. All in favor, motion carries.  

**Discussion:**  
The Committee does not expect a report immediately, and that staff will need to work with the finance department to complete the report. Lorna Smith stated that a straightforward, simple quarterly report is all we are asking for.  

Lorna called the next meeting to be held in September 2014.
VII. Other/ Administrative

Staff Update:
Acquisitions Spreadsheet: The binder of deeds and conservation easements for projects is nearing completion.
Fund Balance to date is $568,780.01.
Membership – Staff is still looking for applicants for the District 1 position

Members would like meeting materials to be provided in electronic format only with the exception of the application materials.

VIII. Observer Comments

None

IX. Adjournment

Chair adjourned the meeting at 4:23 PM.

Submitted by Betsy Carlson and Tami Pokorny
Appendix A

Composite Score Sheets
# Jefferson County Conservation Futures Rating Worksheet 2014

**Project Title:** 2014 QWC  
Andrus  Britten  Christian  Gallant  Gansle  Harbour  Hunter  Jahnke  Kearney  Schrader  Smith  Factor  Composite Total

## CRITERIA

To what degree does the project leverage contributions for acquisitions from groups, agencies or individuals? Points awarded based on the following level of contribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT LEVELS</th>
<th>ADJUSTED WEIGHT (multiplier)</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c. Leverages significantly = 3 points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d. Leverages moderately = 2 points</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. Meets requirement = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 150 |

To what degree does the project sponsor commit to provide long-term stewardship for the proposed project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT LEVELS</th>
<th>ADJUSTED WEIGHT (multiplier)</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Stewardship plan with guaranteed long-term stewardship = 5 points</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Stewardship plan with guaranteed short-term stewardship = 3 points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Stewardship plan, no guarantee = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 530 |

To what degree has the project sponsor demonstrated effective long-term stewardship of a similar project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT LEVELS</th>
<th>ADJUSTED WEIGHT (multiplier)</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Highly demonstrated = 5 points</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Moderately demonstrated = 3 points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Slightly demonstrated = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Effectiveness not demonstrated = 0 points</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 55 |

To what degree is the acquisition feasible?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POINT LEVELS</th>
<th>ADJUSTED WEIGHT (multiplier)</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Highly feasible = 5 points</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Moderately feasible = 3 points</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Slightly feasible = 1 point</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 408 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Sliding Scale 1-5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is the project part of an adopted open space, conservation, or resource preservation program or plan, or identified in a community conservation effort?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding Scale 1-5 points</td>
<td>5  5  5  4  5  5  5  5  5  5  7  378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does the project conserve opportunities which are otherwise lost or threatened?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding Scale 1-5 points</td>
<td>4  5  4  4  5  5  5  3  5  4  5  6  294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does the project preserve habitat for flora and fauna? (Points awarded in part based on level of documentation.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. State of Washington Priority Habitat and/or State or Federal Endangered, Threatened or Sensitive species = 0-3 points</td>
<td>3  3  2  2  3  2  3  2  1  2  3  4  104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Variety of native flora &amp; fauna = 0-3 points</td>
<td>3  3  3  3  3  3  3  3  2  2  3  4  124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c. Provides wildlife corridor or migration route = 0-3 points</td>
<td>3  3  3  1  3  3  3  2  3  2  3  4  116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does the project preserve farmland for agricultural use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. Likely will maintain active agricultural use = 0-3 points</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  4  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b. Participates in other conservation programs = 0-3 points</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  4  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c. Preserves rural cultural heritage = 0-3 points</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  0  4  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does the project serve a significant benefit area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sliding Scale 1-5 points</td>
<td>3  5  4  3  5  5  5  2  3  4  4  4  172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does the acquisition provide educational opportunities, interpretive opportunities, and/or serve as a general community resource?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a. Public access, with plan for educational/interpretive displays and materials = 5 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b. Limited public access, available space for signage and educational materials = 3 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c. Remote location = 1 point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d. No opportunity = 0 points</td>
<td>5  3  5  3  5  5  5  5  5  1  5  4  196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what degree does the project preserve historic or culturally significant resources?

- 11a. Project is registered with the National Register of Historic Places, or an equivalent program = 3 points
- 11b. Project is recognized locally as having historic or cultural resources = 2 points
- 11c. Project is adjacent to and provides a buffer for a historic or cultural site = 1 point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what degree does the project preserve forestland for silvicultural use?

- 12a. Management plan retains or establishes a mix of species and age class = 0-3 points
- 12b. Land is enrolled in public and/or private programs which certify long-term sustainable silviculture: Certified = 3 points; Uncertified = 0 points
- 12c. Participates in other conservation or restoration programs = 0-3 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TOTAL 2548

11 Number of scores

FINAL 232
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINT LEVELS</th>
<th>ADJUSTED WEIGHT (multiplier)</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does the project leverage contributions for acquisitions from groups, agencies or individuals? Points awarded based on the following level of contribution.</td>
<td>1c. Leverages significantly = 3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1d. Leverages moderately = 2 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a. Meets requirement = 1 point</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree does the project sponsor commit to provide long-term stewardship for the proposed project?</td>
<td>2a. Stewardship plan with guaranteed long-term stewardship = 5 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2b. Stewardship plan with guaranteed short-term stewardship = 3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c. Stewardship plan, no guarantee = 1 point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree has the project sponsor demonstrated effective long-term stewardship of a similar project?</td>
<td>3a. Highly demonstrated = 5 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b. Moderately demonstrated = 3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3c. Slightly demonstrated = 1 point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3d. Effectiveness not demonstrated = 0 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is the acquisition feasible?</td>
<td>4a. Highly feasible = 5 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b. Moderately feasible = 3 points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c. Slightly feasible = 1 point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what degree is the project part of an adopted open space, conservation, or resource preservation program or plan, or identified in a community conservation effort?  

| Sliding Scale 1-5 points | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 378 |

To what degree does the project conserve opportunities which are otherwise lost or threatened?  

| Sliding Scale 1-5 points | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 312 |

To what degree does the project preserve habitat for flora and fauna? (Points awarded in part based on level of documentation.)

- **7a. State of Washington Priority Habitat and/or State or Federal Endangered, Threatened or Sensitive species** = 0–3 points  
  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 132 |

- **7b. Variety of native flora & fauna** = 0–3 points  
  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 124 |

- **7c. Provides wildlife corridor or migration route** = 0–3 points  
  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 132 |

To what degree does the project preserve farmland for agricultural use?  

- **8a. Likely will maintain active agricultural use** = 0–3 points  
  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

- **8b. Participates in other conservation programs** = 0–3 points  
  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

- **8c. Preserves rural cultural heritage** = 0–3 points  
  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 |

To what degree does the project serve a significant benefit area?  

| Sliding Scale 1-5 points | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 216 |

To what degree does the acquisition provide educational opportunities, interpretive opportunities, and/or serve as a general community resource?  

- **10a. Public access, with plan for educational/interpretive displays and materials** = 5 points  
  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 124 |

- **10b. Limited public access, available space for signage and educational materials** = 3 points  
  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 124 |

- **10c. Remote location** = 1 point  
  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 124 |

- **10d. No opportunity** = 0 points  
  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 124 |
### To what degree does the project preserve historic or culturally significant resources?

11. Project is registered with the National Register of Historic Places, or an equivalent program = 3 points

11b. Project is recognized locally as having historic or cultural resources = 2 points

11c. Project is adjacent to and provides a buffer for a historic or cultural site = 1 point

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### To what degree does the project preserve forestland for silvicultural use?

12. Management plan retains or establishes a mix of species and age class = 0-3 points

12b. Land is enrolled in public and/or private programs which certify long-term sustainable silviculture Certified = 3 points; Uncertified = 0 points

12c. Participates in other conservation or restoration programs = 0-3 points

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL = 2649

11. Number of scores

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2649</td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>