



Jefferson County Conservation Futures Committee

Monday, May 2, 2011

3:00 – 6:00 PM

**Jefferson County Library,
620 Cedar Avenue, Port Hadlock, WA**

FINAL Minutes

*** Decisions and action items are indicated in bold font.**

Members Present: Phil Andrus, District 2; Lige Christian, District 3; JD Gallant, District 3; Jerry Gorsline, District 2; Rick Jahnke, Coastal Areas; Janet Kearsley, District 1; Phyllis Schultz, Working Lands; Sarah Spaeth, Jefferson Land Trust (left meeting 3:30 PM); Fred Weinmann, Ecology; John Wood, District 1

Members Absent: None

County Staff Present: Tami Pokorny, Water Quality Division

I. Call to Order:

Chair Fred Weinmann called the meeting to order at 3:08 PM on May 2, 2011.

II. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the April 11, 2011 meeting were approved as written.

III. Review of Agenda:

Chair Weinmann invited changes to the agenda. There were none except staff was asked to give the administrative update now because Sarah Spaeth would likely leave the meeting after the ethics questions.

IV. Other/Administrative:

Membership

Tami Pokorny reported that JD Gallant is a confirmed new member. Crystie Kisler has reluctantly resigned from the Committee due to scheduling conflicts. The new vacancy, for a citizen to represent any relevant interest, will be advertised as soon as possible. All of the commissioner districts remain represented.

Fund Balance

No update to the CFF balance was available since the April meeting. The end of March balance was \$403,200.10.

Calendar

Committee recommendations will be presented to the BoCC before the end of June. For all recommended projects, staff will be requesting confirmation from the City and/or County development departments that sufficient capacity would remain to accommodate projected

growth. She will coordinate with the Chair and Committee members to schedule the BoCC presentation as well as a “wrap up” meeting for this funding cycle.

V. Observer comments: None

VI. Old Business: None.

VII. New Business:

A. Deposition of Committee Members with ethics questions based on Chief Deputy Civil Prosecuting Attorney's July 9, 2002 memo.

Tami Pokorny read the following statement, with regard to CARLESON CHIMACUM CREEK ACQUISITION project:

In order to obtain and maintain the appearance of fairness in the 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.

She asked if there were any objections with respect to the WINONA BASIN – BLOEDEL project.

No one voiced any objection.

Tami Pokorny then stated that she would read four questions pertaining to the CARLESON CHIMACUM CREEK ACQUISITION 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?

Jerry Gorsline: I do not.
Janet Kearsley: I do not.
Fred Weinmann: I don't.
Phil Andrus: I do not.
John Wood: I do not.
JD Gallant: I do not.
Rick Jahnke: No
Lige Christian: I do not.
Sarah Spaeth: I do not.
Phyllis Schultz: I do not.

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?

Jerry Gorsline: I am.
Janet Kearsley: I am.
Fred Weinmann: I can.
Phil Andrus: I am.

John Wood: I am.

JD Gallant: I am.

Rick Jahnke: I am.

Lige Christian: I am.

Sarah Spaeth: As the project sponsor, Jefferson Land Trust, I have proposed that these projects be funded and I am recusing myself from the ranking.

Phyllis Schultz: I am.

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? Staff noted that a yes answer is not an automatic disqualification if the nature of the communication is disclosed and others have the opportunity to question/approve its inconsequentiality to this process.

Jerry Gorsline: No

Janet Kearsley: No

Fred Weinmann: No

Phil Andrus: No

John Wood: No

JD Gallant: No

Rick Jahnke: No

Lige Christian: No

Sarah Spaeth: I have spoken with a number of project partners and proponents, whether it was the City of Port Townsend discussing ownership or land owners, and our Chumsortium partners about the proposal for Chimacum Creek.

Phyllis Schultz: 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?

Jerry Gorsline: I have.

Janet Kearsley: I have participated in all of what has been required.

Fred Weinmann: I have as well.

Phil Andrus: So have I.

John Wood: So have I.

JD Gallant: So have I.

Rick Jahnke: So have I.

Lige Christian: So have I.

Sarah Spaeth: I have also.

Phyllis Schultz: I have viewed the video.

With regard to the WINONA BASIN – BLOEDEL Project, staff posed the same set of questions and members gave their responses.

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?

Jerry Gorsline: No.

Janet Kearsley: No.

Fred Weinmann: No.

Phil Andrus: No.

John Wood: No.

JD Gallant: No.

Rick Jahnke: No.

Lige Christian: No.
Sarah Spaeth: No.
Phyllis Schultz: 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?

Jerry Gorsline: Yes.
Janet Kearsley: Yes.
Fred Weinmann: Yes.
Phil Andrus: Yes.
John Wood: Yes.
JD Gallant: Yes.
Rick Jahnke: Yes.
Lige Christian: Yes.

Sarah Spaeth: Once again, as the project applicant and sponsor, I think the Land Trust is hopeful that these projects will be funded and I'll be recusing myself from ranking this project as well as the Carleson project.

Phyllis Schultz: 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?

Jerry Gorsline: No
Janet Kearsley: No
Fred Weinmann: No
Phil Andrus: No
John Wood: No
JD Gallant: No
Rick Jahnke: No
Lige Christian: No

Sarah Spaeth: Yes, I have spoken with the City of Port Townsend and with various neighbors about the possibility of this becoming part of the Quimper Wildlife Corridor project. I have not heard any negative responses to this.

Phyllis Schultz: 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?

Jerry Gorsline: Yes.
Janet Kearsley: Yes.
Fred Weinmann: Yes.
Phil Andrus: Yes.
John Wood: Yes.
JD Gallant: Yes.
Rick Jahnke: Yes.
Lige Christian: Yes.
Sarah Spaeth: Yes.
Phyllis Schultz: Yes.

Janet Kearsley commended the new Committee members (Rick Jahnke and JD Gallant) for attending meetings and events even before their appointments.

Sarah Spaeth thanked the Committee and left the meeting.

Discussion and Rating of 2011 Conservation Futures project applications

Staff noted that all Committee members have submitted their rating sheets and the scores have been compiled into two composite spreadsheets, one for each project.

In the past the Committee has discussed the individual ratings where there was not consensus. Negotiations through the process result in a total score for each project to be divided by the number of people ranking for a final score. Today, the number of scorers will be nine for both projects. Ultimately, in order to make a recommendation to the BoCC, there will need to be a motion as to whether or not each project is worthy of any funding and also motions to establish the amount of funding being recommended for each project.

There was a brief discussion about whether Question 1 of the ratings sheet should receive two answers or one. The question should be flagged for review prior to the next funding cycle.

Members consulted the Word version rating sheet for 2011.

1. Carleson Chimacum Creek Acquisition Rating Process

Chair Weinmann reminded Committee members that it is okay to adjust individual scores based on the discussion surrounding each question.

Members took turns reading the rating questions. Each question was discussed, and scores adjusted as desired, except in situations where all the scores were in agreement. 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 mentioned that the project would leverage CF funding at a ratio of 85% Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) dollars to 15% CFF. The answer to this question could possibly reflect both the degree of leverage and also the variety of matching fund sources. It was noted that the SRFB grant has not yet been applied for but that fact pertains more to the question on the "certainty" of the project.

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

Fred Weinmann thought it was difficult to determine who is going to get the monitoring done and what monitoring they're going to do. He sensed it would be difficult to monitor this 5-acre parcel, with its setting and topography, compared with the Winona parcel. He noted that the Land Trust is very capable, but it is difficult work.

Phil Andrus had the experience of working with Land Trust staff trying to locate markers on uneven ground and was impressed with their diligence. Janet Kearsley thought that it could be difficult to find funds for all the stewardship work that they would like to do. Lige Christian noted that the Committee has a significant track record with JLT. Fred Weinmann commented that, as the number of properties held by the Land Trust increases, the job of stewardship increases. Stewardship funds can be the most difficult to obtain.

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

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

Question 4

To what degree is the acquisition feasible?

- a. Highly feasible = 5 points
- b. Moderately feasible = 3 points
- c. Slightly feasible = 1 point

Fred Weinmann scored this question in relation to the fact that the matching funds are not yet in hand. He felt it would be unreasonable to consider the project "highly feasible" if the grant had not been applied for yet. John Wood felt that feasibility came down to whether the money is available and whether the seller is willing and likely to carry through with the transaction. Lige Christian said that the Committee has historically accepted where the sponsor will be getting the funding. Sponsors have three years post-approval to obtain the grant. 'Feasible' doesn't mean 'certain.' Janet noted that they have a willing land owner, an appraisal, and they've agreed to a price given the resources. In the history of the CF program, no project has defaulted for not obtaining funding within three years. The County's money is often a catalyst for obtaining other funds.

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

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

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

Phyllis Schultz remarked on whether JLT would be able to continue the trail work begun by the land owner. JD Gallant understood that the property was desired first and foremost for the creek and the area around the creek – an area that is definitely at risk of being lost or threatened. The site is very desirable, accessible and developable.

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
- b. Variety of native flora & fauna = 0–3 points
- c. Provides wildlife corridor or migration route = 0–3 points

Several members mentioned the importance of the presence of the ESA listed run of chum salmon to their ratings. Janet Kearsley suggested that the application should include a request for specific information about species or habitat listings. Fred Weinmann noted that there was a lot of disturbance at the site and nothing unusual botanically. Lige Christian felt that the focus of the question should be the creek and the variety of life associated with it. Jerry Gorsline pointed out that the site also provides habitat for many bird species. Some members agreed that it would have been nice to have more data on creek invertebrates. As a wildlife corridor or migration route, JD Gallant felt that the creek rather than the surrounding land provides the greatest opportunities for wildlife migration. Janet Kearsley, who at one time lived on the creek, had observed cougar and bobcat travelling through. After further discussion, there was general agreement that the protected areas did function as an upland and riparian corridor.

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

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

Question 9

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

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

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

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

Phyllis Schultz felt that there was potential for public access for education especially considering the presence of the existing picnic shelter. Others understood that the Land Trust would like to bring interpretive trips there. Lige Christian said that in the past public access has been associated with some kind of interpretive or educational opportunity rather than complete openness for public access which could conflict with conservation goals. There was a general

sense that access does not need to be unrestricted. This project was developed in part to help complete the migration corridor. Fred Weinmann felt there were other sites better suited to education on salmon migration.

Question 11

To what degree does the project preserve historic or culturally significant resources¹?

- 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

There was a very brief discussion and agreement that little or no historically or culturally significant resources are involved.

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 point Uncertified = 0 points

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

Janet Kearsley moved to nominate the project for funding. The motion was seconded by Phyllis Schultz.

A glitch in the spread sheet was discovered. There was no other discussion.

Fred Weinmann called for a vote. By show of hands, the motion was approved unanimously.

During a break called by Fred Weinmann, the spreadsheet glitch was identified (wrong multiplier in Question #3) and corrected for both project spreadsheets.

Fred Weinmann called the meeting back to order. The total score for CARLESON CHIMACUM CREEK ACQUISITION project was 2141; the weighted average was 238 (2141 divided by nine raters).

2. Winona Basin – Bloedel Rating Process

The Committee then began the same process for the Winona Basin – Bloedel project.

Question 1

To what degree does the project leverage contributions for acquisition from groups, agencies or individuals?

- d. leverages significantly = 3 points
- e. leverages moderately = 2 points
- f. meets requirement = 1 point

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.

Members discussed that, although the project match was essentially in place, this question refers only to the ratio of the CF contribution to the match.

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 scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

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

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

Question 4

To what degree is the acquisition feasible?

- a. Highly feasible = 5 points
- b. Moderately feasible = 3 points
- c. Slightly feasible = 1 point

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

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

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

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

As in the previous project, the Land Trust has worked with the landowner over many years for the opportunity to acquire the property. Some members felt that this land was less desirable and more difficult to develop than the Chimacum Creek property. It could become more desirable in the future. Fred Weinmann said that the price per lot reflects the potential for development - \$7,500 per lot.

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
- b. Variety of native flora & fauna = 0–3 points
- c. Provides wildlife corridor or migration route = 0–3 points

JD Gallant didn't see anything exceptional about the land. Janet Kearsley explained that she rated it a "1" for this question because some of the species are on the state list. The way the application is currently written, though, this isn't clear. The application gives a list of species but not broken out by state, federal etc. Bald eagles are no longer listed federally but may still be state listed. Peregrine falcons, pileated woodpeckers, band tailed pigeons, and merlin are still on the state sensitive list. The olive-sided fly catcher also. The question does not only pertain to federal ESA listings in other words. Fred Weinmann noted that many properties in Jefferson County would have this same list of sensitive species. Several preliminary scores were adjusted. There was conversation about whether to interpret the question for the Quimper Wildlife Corridor as a whole or only for these particular lots. As a piece of a whole it has all kinds of important species. Lige Christian gave it a lower rating initially because there aren't ESA listed threatened species present. It was acknowledged that the overarching concept of the project is to establish a wildlife corridor.

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

All scores in agreement. No discussion necessary.

Question 9

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

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

The corridor begins in the City and ends in the County, but the current project area has a very limited extent. Janet Kearsley pointed out that the Land Trust looks at the project as a local one. Jerry Gorsline felt that the benefit was broader since the Quimper Wildlife Corridor has a regional draw for bicyclists.

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

The parcel itself won't have public access and there won't be signage. The Corridor has opportunities for walking and biking, but the project area only complements the existing recreational opportunities. Jerry Gorsline mentioned the trained docents volunteering in the Corridor and the tremendous educational value of that. JD Gallant felt that the question should

be weighed against the project area only. Lige Christian felt that this issue can't be settled in situations where the project is being proposed specifically to be part of a larger corridor. Particularly in the case of the Carleson Chimacum Creek acquisition, the project will almost complete a wildlife corridor. The value extends beyond the project parcel. Phil Andrus recalled that Finnriver Farm also has monthly walks and trained docents. It's difficult to see any single parcel by itself and to evaluate it apart from the larger context. John Wood felt that the question should be revised to say "potential" educational value. He considered how the addition of the project area would enhance the existing educational values. He didn't feel it added anything that the corridor doesn't already have. Fred Weinmann noted that the Winona Wetland is a particularly important part of the Corridor for wildlife. This project would complete the buffer around the wetland. If this project isn't acquired, and instead a house is built, it would change circumstances for a large area. Several preliminary scores were adjusted. JD Gallant remembered that the Land Trust has no plans for public access to this site.

Question 11

To what degree does the project preserve historic or culturally significant resources²?

- 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

Lige Christian pointed out that another option for "0" is needed for this question - a "d" to indicate no historical or culturally significant resources. For now a "no answer" can suffice for this.

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 point Uncertified = 0 points

Since there is no management plan, members agreed a "0" was appropriate for "a."
There was no discussion on "b."

The total score for WINONA BASIN - BLOEDEL project was 2018; the weighted average was 224 (2018 divided by nine raters).

Phil Andrus moved to nominate the project for funding. The motion was seconded by Lige Christian.

There was no discussion.

Fred Weinmann called for a vote. By show of hands, the motion was approved unanimously.

Lige Christian moved to rank the projects as follows:

- 1. Carleson Chimacum Creek Acquisition**
- 2. Winona Basin – Bloedel**

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.

Phil Andrus seconded.

Lige Christian chose to rank the projects consistent with the scores they had received from the Committee. In the past, where a project with a lower score was given a higher final ranking, a justification was provided. The ranking in this case should reflect the scores. Phyllis Schultz pointed out that the difference in scores was not great. Mr. Christian clarified that his ultimate intention is to make a motion to fully fund the projects. In the unlikely event it is not possible to fully fund both, the Committee has indicated its preference.

Phil Andrus considers the Chimacum project more vital due to the salmon run. Phyllis Schultz felt the projects to be of equal value since a house built on the Winona project area would have a significant impact on the Quimper Wildlife Corridor. Several other members felt the projects were of equal value, but for different reasons. Rick Jahnke sees the Chimacum Creek corridor as a system stretching from Irondale Road down to the estuary where the effort to protect the salmon corridor is essentially complete. If the property were to go on the open market, it would likely be sold easily whereas there are many similar properties in the vicinity of the Winona project. The Winona property is an important piece of the bigger project but it doesn't complete the effort in the same way that the Chimacum parcel does. He would also put Chimacum ahead.

Fred Weinmann called the question.

AYES
Jerry Gorsline
Janet Kearsley
Phil Andrus
JD Gallant
Rick Jahnke
Lige Christian

NAY
John Wood
Phyllis Schultz

Fred Weinmann abstained. The motion passed.

Lige Christian then moved to fully fund both projects. Janet Kearsley seconded the motion.

Mr. Christian pointed out that the commissioners do not have to take the advice of the Committee, so it's helpful to spell out where the priorities are.

JD Gallant made a friendly amendment that funding levels be the same as those requested in the applications. Lige Christian accepted the amendment. Fred Weinmann called the question. The motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Observer Comments: None

IX. Adjournment:

Fred Weinmann adjourned the meeting at 5:07 PM.

Appendix A
Composite Rating Sheets

Jefferson County Conservation Futures Rating Worksheet 2011

Project Title: **CARLESON**

Andrus Christian Gallant Gorsline Jahnke Kearsley Schultz Weinmann Wood

Factor Composite Total

ADJUSTED WEIGHT (multiplier) SCORE

CRITERIA	POINT LEVELS													
1	To what degree does the project leverage contributions for acquisitions from groups, agencies or individuals? <i>Points awarded based on the following level of contribution.</i>	1c. Leverages significantly = 3 points 1d. Leverages moderately = 2 points 1e. Meets requirement = 1 point	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	5	125	
2	To what degree does the project sponsor commit to provide long-term stewardship for the proposed project?	2a. Stewardship plan with guaranteed long-term stewardship = 5 points 2b. Stewardship plan with guaranteed short-term stewardship = 3 points 2c. Stewardship plan, no guarantee = 1 point	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	10	430	
3	To what degree has the project sponsor demonstrated effective long-term stewardship of a similar project?	3a. Highly demonstrated = 5 points 3b. Moderately demonstrated = 3 points 3c. Slightly demonstrated = 1 point 3d. Effectiveness not demonstrated = 0 points	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	45	
4	To what degree is the acquisition feasible?	4a. Highly feasible = 5 points 4b. Moderately feasible = 3 points 4c. Slightly feasible = 1 point	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	8	360	
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?	5a. Site identified in the adopted plan = 5 points 5b. Site is not identified in the adopted plan, but the project complements an adopted plan = 3 points 5c. Stand alone project with an adopted plan and potential to stimulate broader conservation efforts = 1 point	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	7	315	
6	To what degree does the project conserve opportunities which are otherwise lost or threatened?	6a. Significantly threatened = 5 points 6b. Moderately threatened = 3 points 6c. Slightly threatened = 1 point 6d. Not threatened = 0 points	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	3	6	234

Jefferson County Conservation Futures Rating Worksheet 2011

Project Title: **WINONA**

Andrus Christian Gallant Gorsline Jahnke Kearsley Schultz Weinmann Wood

Factor

Composite
Total

ADJUSTED
WEIGHT
(multiplier) SCORE

CRITERIA

POINT LEVELS

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

1

- 1c. Leverages significantly = 3 points
- 1d. Leverages moderately = 2 points
- 1e. Meets requirement = 1 point

	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	5	110
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------

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

2

- 2a. Stewardship plan with guaranteed long-term stewardship = 5 points
- 2b. Stewardship plan with guaranteed short-term stewardship = 3 points
- 2c. Stewardship plan, no guarantee = 1 point

	5	10	450									
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------	------------

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

3

- 3a. Highly demonstrated = 5 points
- 3b. Moderately demonstrated = 3 points
- 3c. Slightly demonstrated = 1 point

3d. Effectiveness not demonstrated = 0 points

	5	1	45									
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------

To what degree is the acquisition feasible?

4

- 4a. Highly feasible = 5 points
- 4b. Moderately feasible = 3 points
- 4c. Slightly feasible = 1 point

	5	8	360									
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------

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?

5

- 5a. Site identified in the adopted plan = 5 points
- 5b. Site is not identified in the adopted plan, but the project complements an adopted plan = 3 points
- 5c. Stand alone project with an adopted plan and potential to stimulate broader conservation efforts = 1 point

	5	7	315									
--	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------

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

6

- 6a. Significantly threatened = 5 points

6b. Moderately threatened = 3 points
 6c. Slightly threatened = 1 point
 6d. Not threatened = 0 points

3	5	3	3	3	3	5	3	3	6	186
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

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

7a	7a. State of Washington Priority Habitat and/or State or Federal Endangered, Threatened or Sensitive species = 0–3 points	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2	1	4	80
7b	7b. Variety of native flora & fauna = 0–3 points	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	1	4	92
7c	7c. Provides wildlife corridor or migration route = 0–3 points	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	108

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

8a	8a. Participates in other conservation programs = 0–3 points	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
8b	8b. Likely will maintain active agricultural use = 0–3 points	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
8c	8c. Preserves rural cultural heritage = 0–3 points	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0

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

9a. Broad county benefit = 5 points
 9b. Localized benefit = 3 points

3	3	3	5	3	3	3	5	3	4	124
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

10 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
 10b. Limited public access, available space for signage and educational materials = 3 points
 10c. Remote location = 1 point
 10d. No opportunity = 0 points

5	5	3	5	3	3	5	5	3	4	148
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

11 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

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

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0

TOTAL SCORE

2018