

# **Virginia Saltwater Recreational Fishing Development Fund Evaluation of a Proposal for the Development of a Tangible Structure, Facility or Educational Program**

**Project Number: 0412-17**

**Date: 22 June 2012**

**Title: Q) Greenbackville Harbor Enhancements.**

The Virginia Saltwater Recreational Fishing Development Fund is to be used solely for the purpose of conserving and enhancing finfish taken by recreational anglers, enforcing laws and regulations related to natural resource conservation, improving recreational fishing opportunities, administering the Virginia Saltwater Fishing Tournament program, obtaining necessary data and conducting research for fisheries management, and creating or restoring habitat for species taken by recreational fishermen.

Code of Virginia, Section 28.2-302.3

**NOTE: Please read the entire score sheet before beginning, provide comments, and then circle ( ) the appropriate score. Thank You.**

## **A. Project Purpose**

### **1. Does the project meet statutory guidelines for funding?**

This project clearly meets funding guidelines as set forth in the Code of Virginia. The repair and operation of a “no-fee” boat ramp with direct access to saltwater clearly meets statutory guidelines for “improving recreational fishing opportunities”.

### **2. Does the project fulfill a real need and/or provide a substantial benefit to the saltwater recreational fishery?**

I do not know when this ramp and bulkhead were built but it was likely 20 years or more ago. Significant maintenance seems warranted at this facility to preserve a very valuable access point for saltwater anglers. The boarding piers seem in greatest need of repair,

### **3. Does the project provides its main, or substantial, benefits to the saltwater recreational angler?**

This facility is located on a very pristine section of Chincoteague Bay and this site is also popular for some non-fishing activities but I believe a very substantial portion of this project will directly benefit saltwater anglers.

## **B. Project Analysis**

### **1. What are the project's strengths?**

The project proposal would preserve an existing and popular saltwater boating access point. The county of Accomack has a proven track record of managing this multi-use property in addition to providing a 25% cash match.

### **2. What are the project's weaknesses?**

More detail would be useful to evaluate the project. For instance, there is not enough detail provided to determine what, if any, concrete work is the proposal for the ramps. Obviously the adjacent loading docks need rehabilitation. Does this account for the entire \$175,000 budgeted for the ramp? The sign in the picture of the boat ramp states, "Before overnight docking contact harbor master." So overnight docking is available to anyone? Is there a fee? Who has docking rights/privileges?

Regarding the \$150,000 "pledged" from an unnamed source, how solid is this source and what would become of the project if this sum is not forthcoming?

Could monies requested from the RFAB (\$225,000) be prioritized to improvements to the boat ramp portion of the project (estimated at \$175,000) since this part of the overall project offers the most direct benefit to recreational anglers.

The proposal indicates 3,000 recreational anglers used the facility in 2010, are figures available for the other users of the facility?

Has the available parking proven to be adequate?

## **C. Project Budget**

### **1. Is the budget realistic and reasonable for 1) the size and type of project proposal 2) the number of people likely to benefit; and, 3) the area benefiting from the project considering the area's number of saltwater fishermen and license sales?**

1) Not sure if concrete work is part of the proposal, or if so, to what extent. If the concrete ramps are scheduled to be completely re-done then the cost for the boat ramp repairs/replacement is very reasonable. The cost of repairing the bulk head work appears inline with going rates but the type/grade of material to be used should be specified.

2) Given the number of anglers likely to benefit from the project on a yearly basis multiplied by the life expectancy of the project the budget is very reasonable

3) This area has many avid local anglers and enjoys a considerable amount of tourism from neighboring states all of whom contribute to license sales.

**2. What is the local commitment to the project (cost sharing, future management and maintenance, in-kind commitments of personnel, etc.)?**

The local commitment to the project meets MRFAB guidelines. MRFAB guidelines for “facility” projects (piers, ramps, structures, etc) call for a 25% dollar match (cash and or direct construction costs) from the community/organization proposing the project. The Accomac County is committing \$125,000 in “hard” dollars to the project – 25% of the project funding.

**D. Provide an overall evaluation of the project, including a numerical ranking of the project on the "SCORE" scale provided.**

This project will fulfill a real need by preserving an existing, well established access point. All the accessible waters are saltwater and require a saltwater fishing license. Portions of this project should be prioritized as it is unclear if the money for the total cost of the project has been secured. Should there be a shortfall, the best use of the RFAB monies would be to address the boat ramp and the adjacent loading docks. The project as presented should receive favorable consideration, although prioritizing portions of the expenditures might best serve the angling public.

<b>SCORE (Circle One)</b>	<b>Poor</b>					<b>Fair</b>				<b>Excellent</b>	
	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>( 8 )</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>