Phase 2 Wrap-up
Meeting 7.1 | August 11, 2022, 8 - 11 a.m.
Today’s Meeting

• Impacts to junior tax districts focus group update
• Pilot project scoring results
• Comments received
• Looking ahead
Impacts to Junior Tax Districts: Focus Group Update
Purpose

• Examine current options in the TLT tool and identify alternatives.
• Evaluate potential of options to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts.
• Suggest steps toward implementation of options.
Timeline

• September 1, 2022 – Kick-off Meeting

• September 16, 2022 – Working Meeting #1
  o Examine current options in the TLT tool and identify alternatives.

• September 29, 2022 – Working Meeting #2
  o Evaluate potential of options to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts.

• October 13, 2022 – Working Meeting #3
  o Suggest steps toward implementation of options.
Participants

- Fire district
- Rural hospital district
- Library district
- Washington State School Directors Association
- County assessor
- County treasurer
- Washington Association of Counties
- Other tax districts
TLT Phase 2 Work Group

Pilot Project Scoring Results
### How Final Scores Were Calculated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator</th>
<th>Community Involvement</th>
<th>Ecological Values</th>
<th>Economic Values</th>
<th>Public Benefits</th>
<th>Tribal Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-5</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-9</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-11</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP-14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval. Score</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Eval. Score</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sample worksheet for one parcel**

- Entered the raw scores from each evaluator
- Subtotaled the scores
- Averaged the scores
- Multiply the average score by the multiplier to derive the "total evaluation score" for each criteria
- Sum the total evaluation scores
## Final Prioritized List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Parcel Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Receiving Agency</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eglon</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>44.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Devils Lake</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>DNR Natural Areas</td>
<td>43.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upper Dry Gulch</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>DNR Natural Areas</td>
<td>40.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chapman Lake</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>WDFW</td>
<td>38.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Morningstar</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>DNR Natural Areas</td>
<td>38.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>West Tiger</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>DNR Natural Areas</td>
<td>36.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lake Spokane Campground</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Washington State Parks</td>
<td>35.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Blakely Island</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>San Juan County</td>
<td>32.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moses Lake Sand Dunes</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rustler's Gulch</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>WDFW</td>
<td>29.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Final Scores Broken out by Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Parcel Name</th>
<th>Community Involvement</th>
<th>Ecological values</th>
<th>Economic Values</th>
<th>Public Benefits</th>
<th>Tribal Support</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Score Range</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eglon</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>44.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Devils Lake</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>43.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Upper Dry Gulch</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>40.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chapman Lake</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>38.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Morningstar</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>38.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>West Tiger</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>36.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lake Spokane Campground</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>35.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Blakely Island</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>32.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moses Lake Sand Dunes</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>29.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rustler's Gulch</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>29.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Received
Summarized and Organized by TLT Steps
Step One of the TLT Process

Step One includes:

- Submittal of applications for proposed TLT parcels (regions as applicants for pilot project).

- DNR’s determination of whether the proposed parcels are eligible for TLT:
  - Best interests of the trusts analysis, and
  - Verification of receiving agency.
Comments on Step One

Applications: Formatting and language

• Make form a fillable pdf with consistent fonts and use page numbers.
• Limit the size of the box for each response.
• Limit the use of jargon.
• Number the criteria and make sure the criteria order is the same on the application and the scoring sheets.
• Make sure examples of criteria provided are the same across all forms.
Applications: Completeness

• Some applications were more complete than others. The more detailed applications were easier to score.

• Criteria tend to overlap each other. Applicants should fill out each criteria completely, even if some information will be repeated under different criteria.
Applications: Completeness, continued

• Include all information needed to score the parcel, so reviewers do not have to reference other documents. This includes information from tribal outreach.

• Information on community involvement was uneven across the applications. Include letters of support if available.

• Request a short (200 word) introduction to the parcel.
Applications: Completeness, continued

- Give the receiving agency a chance to contribute to the application.
- Require three maps: the parcel itself, the vicinity, and the location of the parcel within the state.
Step Two of the TLT Process

Step Two includes:

• Tribal outreach on all parcels that DNR has determined are in the best interests of the trust beneficiaries.

• Applicant presentation of eligible parcels to the advisory committee (not part of pilot project).

• Advisory committee evaluation and ranking of the parcels into a prioritized list using prioritization criteria.
Prioritization criteria

On the point range for public benefits, revise the statement for five points to “The parcel has exceptional public benefits or increases current public benefits.” Parcels that increase public benefits should get a higher score.

Scoring sheets

If there are two scoring sheets, link them so that data entered on one sheet will populate the linked field on the second sheet.
Scoring instructions

Instruct committee members to score each parcel on its own merits rather than scoring parcels against each other.
Scoring challenges: Community involvement and support

- Community support was hard to score if there was good support but also some opposition.
Scoring challenges: Ecological values

• Ecological values were hard to score because some parcels may have a lot of ecological values but little evidence of how the receiving agency will preserve those values, and vice versa.

• Other criteria can conflict with ecological values. For example, increased recreation use may conflict with conservation of a rare plant community.
Scoring challenges: Economic values

• It is hard to gauge how a transfer could impact a local economy, especially remote parcels with little public use.

• It is hard to determine the magnitude of the impact.

• It is not clear on whether a positive economic impact can be ongoing (such as a site that is already being used for recreation) or occur after transfer (such as a site that will see new recreation use).
Scoring challenges: Public benefits

Public benefits was difficult to score because it seems like any transfer would offer at least moderate public benefits to make it to the list. It would help to have additional guidance or examples to help reviewers distinguish between a moderate and an outstanding public benefit.
Scoring challenges: Tribal support

- Tribal support was hard to score because there was so little information about tribal feedback.
- [DNR comment: Some reviewers rated tribal support as zero.]
General comments

• Some guidance on how to consider parcel size would be helpful. For example, a small parcel may offer outstanding benefits, but a larger parcel may receive a higher score because of its larger impact.

• It was difficult to score parcels that will be added to an existing NAP/NRCA; the tendency is to judge the value of the area as a whole. Some direction on scoring these parcels would be helpful.
General comments, continued

• A written dialog that details the reason for the prioritization would be helpful (from each evaluator?)

Other comments on Step Two: Tribal Outreach and Prioritization?
The remaining steps of the TLT process come after the pilot process:

• Step three, Board of Natural Resources approval and legislative funding
• Step four, transfer of parcel and purchase of replacement lands

Some aspects of the TLT process are not tied to specific steps, such as the website, administrative funding, statutory changes, and tracking and reporting.
Other comments on the pilot project or TLT in general?
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Looking Ahead
Next Steps

• DNR will present the parcel list at the September 6th Board of Natural Resources meeting.
• DNR will submit a funding request to the Office of Financial Management later in September.
• The tax district focus group will meet in September and October.
• DNR will develop proposed statutory language for the 2023 legislative session.
• Other TLT implementation work is ongoing.
Future Communication

• This is the last, formal meeting of the Phase 2 Work Group.

• In the future, DNR may offer follow-up conference calls (on Zoom but not formal meetings) to share updates.

• Let us know if you would be interested in staying involved.
Thank you!