

SUNDAY MAY 23, 1971

I. Opening of Meeting, Determination Quorum, Introductions, Additions and Approval of Minutes, March 2, 1971, Additions to Agenda

II. Status Reports

A. Fiscal Status Reports

B. Planning Status Report

Demand - Origin and Destination Study; Out-of-state visitor study; special socio-economic studies; inventories; Second home study; Water surface area inventory

Distribution Model

Special Studies

Plan Format, graphics, text, action program

C. Special Studies

Southwest Washington; Trails; Skagit River; Rivers Study

"A Proposed Streamway Classification and Management System for State of Washington" - Scott and Rivers Study Committee

D. Project Status Report

Added:

Fiscal Officer Report - Billings

Interfund Loan - and Bond purchase \$10 m.

III State Agencies - Old Business

A. Dept. of Natural Resources

(1) 1969-71 Recreation Sites Development (IAC #69-710D) Cost Increase

(2) 1969-71 Development Program (Handicapped Sites) - Cost Increase

B. Dept. of Game

(1) 1969-71 Statewide Water Access - 17 sites \$ 179,175

(2) 1969-71 Freshwater Shorelands Development 55,000

(3) (Boggans, Desert Wildlife, Chehalis, Lower Methow, Fishing Floats)

C. Parks and Recreation Commission

(1) 1969-71 Puget Sound Boating Access

(a) Cornet Bay Development - \$56,490

(b) Saddlebag Island - \$125,000 (deferred until Monday, May 24, 1971)

IV State Agencies - New Business

A. <u>State Agencies - 1971-73 Action Program</u>	\$ 4,538,347	Game
	1,765,672	DNR
	6,742,536	Parks and Rec. Comm.

B. Department of Natural Resources

(1) 1971-73 Biennium Program Presentation

(2) Sultan Basin Scenic Road - Development \$225,000

(3) 1971-73 Recreation Sites Development - 6 sites \$211,000

C. Department of Game

(1) 1971-73 Biennium Program Presentation

(2) L. T. Murray, Stage III \$ 600,000

(3) Stillwater Wildlife Recreation Area, Stage II \$150,000

(4) Boat Launch - Fiscal Year 1972 \$ 395,890.50

D. Parks and Recreation Commission

(1)	1971-73 Biennium Program Presentation	
(2)	1971-73 Biennium Development Projects	
	Jones Beach	\$ 354,149
	Fort Canby	1,065,207
	Fort Worden	235,619
	Blake Island	532,059
	Walter Daniels	333,766
	Potholes	485,970
	Wanapum	259,808
		<u>\$ 3,266,578</u>

MONDAY MAY 24, 1971

Added:

Saddlebag Island \$125,000 approved with stipulation that
P&R Commission re-examine costs involved, etc.

V. Local Projects - Old Business

A. Uniform Relocation Assistance

B. Cost Increases - projects

(1)	Meadowdale - Snohomish County	\$ 8,008
(2)	Havermale Island 2A - Spokane	54,825
(3)	Wildcat Lake, Kitsap County	59,750
(4)	Mercer Island	68,426
(5)	Rochester Park, Spokane	6,000
(6)	Elliott Bay, Seattle	24,187.50

Added:

Authority of Administrator re 10% - development costs

August Meeting date of IAC

VI Local Projects - New Business

A. Local Action Program 1971-73 Biennium

B. New Project Considerations

Mercer Slough - BOR Contingency \$4,00,000 50% BOR 2,000,000
50% Local 2,000,000
(with \$1,300,000 donated of the
2,000,000 figure)

Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

9:00 a.m. - Sunday May 23, 1971) 2 Day Public Meeting Eddie Mays Inn
9:00 a.m. - Monday May 24, 1971) E. Wenatchee, Washington

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Lewis A. Bell, Mr. Omar Lofgren, Mr. Jack Rottler, Mr. Warren A. Bishop, Mrs. Frederick Lemere, Mr. Carl N. Crouse, Director of Game; Mr. Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission; Mr. Daniel B. Ward, Director, Commerce and Economic Development; Honorable Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands. (Present Monday: Mr. George N. Andrews, Director, Department of Highways)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Sunday and Monday: Mr. Thor C. Tollefson, Director, Department of Fisheries
Monday: Mr. George N. Andrews, Director, Department of Highways

STAFF OF MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT

Department of Highways
Willa Mylroie, Research Engineer

Department of Fisheries
Elmer Quistorff, Asst. Chief, Contract Section

Department of Game
Jack Wayland, Rec. Resource Specialist
Monday: Dan C. Barnett
Don G. Johnson
Stanley Scott

State Parks and Recreation Commission
Jan Tveten, Capital Budget Coordinator
William Bush

Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management
Daniel Keller, Fiscal Analyst

Department of Natural Resources
Al O'Donnell, Technical Assistant
Lloyd R. Bell
Monday: Chuck Butler
Donald Boyd

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Stanley E. Francis, Administrator
E. V. Putnam, Assistant Administrator
R. Philip Clark, Program Coordinator
Robert S. Lemcke, Rec. Resource Specialist
Leighton Pratt, Rec. Resource Specialist
Glenn Moore, Rec. Resource Specialist
D. Rodney Mack, Sr. Recreation Planner
Kenn Cole, Fiscal Officer
Marjorie M. Frazier, Administrative Secretary

SUNDAY - May 23	Pgs. 2-21
MONDAY - May 24	Pgs. 22-32

Assistant Attorney General
Richard Lancefield, AGO

Department of Ecology
Beecher Snipes, Supervisor, Planning and Development

LOCAL TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Fearn, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane
Joan Blaisdell, Federal-State Project Coordinator, City of Bellevue
Andrew Pendergast, Superintendent, Parks and Recreation, City of Bremerton
David Towne, Office of the Mayor, Seattle, Washington

OTHER AGENCIES:

Ernie E. Allen, Acting Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Seattle
Edward Johnson, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Seattle
Louise Steele, Housing and Urban Development, Seattle
Charles Seldomridge, Puget Sound Governmental Conference, Seattle
Wilfred R. Woods, Parks and Recreation Commission (Wenatchee)

1. Opening of Meeting, Determination of Quorum, Introductions, Additions and Approval of Minutes of March 2, 1971, Additions to Agenda.

Chairman Bell called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., seven members of the Interagency Committee representing a quorum. Mr. Francis introduced Mr. E. E. Allen, Acting Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Seattle, and Mr. Ed Johnson, who will be working with IAC staff on BOR grants-in-aid.

Approval of Minutes, March 2, 1971: Corrections or additions to the minutes of March 2, 1971, were then called for by the Chairman. In the absence of Mr. Andrews, Director, Department of Highways, Mrs. Mylroie was asked to read the addition to the minutes proposed by that department:

Page 16, end of paragraph 1, insert: "At the Technical Review Committee meeting a question was raised concerning the safety of fishermen crossing the state highway as they followed the streambank easement. The Department of Highways offered a pedestrian easement under the highway at the north end of the Quilcene River Bridge to provide a safe undercrossing for these fishermen."

Mr. Odegaard mentioned corrections to the minutes sent to the Administrator by his department which he had been advised had been made to the official minutes but since they were not of major significance did not need to be submitted to the Committee as a whole for consideration. Mr. Bell stated he was aware of the corrections and agreed they did not need to be reviewed by the Committee since they had been made prior to adoption of the minutes by the Committee and included in the official minutes as being change of language. For the record, the following changes were made to the minutes prior to official adoption and are therefore in the official minute record:

Page 5, 2nd paragraph - line 9 - delete "pointed out that" and insert "inquired of Mr. Scott if"

Line 10, delete "would also be"

Line 15, delete "however, felt" and insert "asked Mr. Scott if he (Mr. Odegaard) had understood correctly"

Page 5, Line 17 - Change from "and that it would appear" to "and would it appear"

Page 6, 2nd paragraph, line 8, change "is doing" to "did"

Page 10, 1st paragraph, line 5, change "more" to "less"

Page 13, 2nd and 3rd paragraphs, capitalize "T" in "The Nature Conservancy" where applicable

Page 13, last paragraph, prior to last paragraph, add "In response to a request from the Chairman."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WARD, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE MINUTES AS CORRECTED AND AMENDED BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II. Status Reports

A. Fiscal Status Report: Chairman Bell referred to staff memorandum of May 23, 1971, "Fiscal Status Report", and called upon Kenn Cole for explanation of the four reports attached to the memo:

- (1) Status Report of Operating Expense
- (2) Interim Statement of Operating Expense (July 1, 1969-April 30, 1971)
- (3) Disbursement Record - Local Agency Projects (February 1, 1971 - April 30, 1971)
- (4) Fund Summary - April 30, 1971

In discussing project billings, Mr. Francis pointed out that the Federal auditors preferred to have more timely partial billings received rather than postponement to effect larger billings...In other words, the cash flow achieving a more regular and even pattern in billing procedure. Mr. Bell commended the staff on the reduction made in the backlog of billings on old projects, and stated that the procedure of not taking any new projects at the last meeting was one of the reasons the staff had been able to accomplish this task. In response to a question from Mr. Rottler concerning Initiative 215 funds, Mr. Kenn Cole explained the difference in figures on the Fund Summary Report and the Interim Statement of Operating Expense. The Fund Summary is a cumulative report from the beginning of operations of the IAC indicating a net expenditure of \$528,000 from Initiative 215 source; whereas the Interim Statement of Operating Expense Report indicates expenditure of \$334,458.11 from this source in this biennium.

B. Planning Status Report: Mr. Rod Mack referred to memorandum of staff entitled "Planning Status", dated May 23, 1971, and explained the new format of the planning report as it will be issued in the future. The planning operations of the IAC as they relate to updating the Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan were outlined in graphic form listing percentages of completion of each task. The Chairman asked that the Planning Status Report as shown be made a part of the official minutes of each IAC meeting. A chart attached to the memorandum, indicating the critical path schedule of work to be accomplished in the planning program of the IAC was also explained by Mr. Mack. This chart portrayed the planning work process from the present time until the SCORP is scheduled to be submitted to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. In his explanations, Mr. Mack pointed out the following:

Demand: (1) Michael McGuire of Western Washington State College, presently conducting the Demand Study, will present his findings at the August 1971 meeting of the IAC.

(2) Origin and Destination Study -- is being initiated as a part of the Southwest Washington Study and will be included in the State Recreation Plan (SCORP). This

is a study of the origin and destination of overnight camping at Washington State Parks by use of receipts from 1970 camping use. A 10% sample is being taken of those receipts to determine the location of the origin or residence of the various state park users. These will be coded and computerized for analysis.

(3) Out-of-state Visitor Study: This study is one-fourth completed; surveys have been made on two days with six more days survey work remaining.

(4) Special Socio-economic studies: Programmed for the next biennium.

Supply: (5) Inventory of Public Agencies: All inventories from the federal sector have been received except from the National Park Service. Returns have been received from the Forest Service, Highways and most of the colleges of the state. Completed inventory forms have been received from all but about 80 agencies out of approximately 300 contacted. Follow up will be made in this area.

(6) Inventory of Private Sector: In June, inventory forms will be distributed to approximately 1,000 businesses.

(7) Inventory of potentially available lands: Programmed for the next biennium -- although preliminary work will commence in the current biennium.

(8) Second Home Study: Draft of the Second Home Study report has been distributed for review by the various agencies involved. A final report will be distributed in late June and copies will be furnished the Interagency Committee members.

(9) Water Surface area inventory: Presently in process and report will be issued later.

Special

Studies: (10) Revision of the Distribution Model was reported as being essentially complete. Bert Cole inquired what the Distribution Model was designed to accomplish. Mr. Mack explained it is basically a computer program pulling together all of the other information referred to in the Demand and Supply categories of his current report which would indicate the levels of need for future acquisition and development of recreation lands. In response to a question from Mr. Bell, Mr. Mack stated the information gathered by the IAC would be available for use of any local, state or public agency desiring to use it. However, due to the limited staff of the IAC, it would probably not be possible for special surveys to be made in response to requests of agencies. Mr. Bell suggested to the Administrator that all of the planning information which was pertinent for use by local agencies be made available to them.

Discussion followed concerning the Corps of Engineers' interest in various projects coming before the IAC. Mrs. Lemere asked whether the Technical Committee had representation from the Corps of Engineers. It was the consensus of the Committee that the Corps be represented on the Technical Committee, and the Chairman instructed the Administrator to contact that agency for the name of a representative. Mrs. Lemere and Mr. Crouse then commented on the new seacoast management bill (Substitute House Bill #584) and environmental statements required for water-oriented projects. Mrs. Blaisdell mentioned the River Basin Coordinating Committee (RIBCO) which has authorized engineering studies of the Green and Duwamish river waterways with the purpose of determining water, sewer and other land uses including recreation. Staff was instructed to investigate the work of this organization.

(11) Development of User and Conservation Standards: Effort is being made to survey all other states on user and conservation standards. This information is presently coming in to the IAC.

(12) Statewide Trails System and (13) Rivers Study: Estimated as 30 and 10 percent complete, respectively.

Final

SCORP: (14) Plan Format, graphics, text, action program: Mr. Mack reported very little actual work had been accomplished in this area though some sections have been drafted. Bert Cole inquired when the plan was due for final submission. Mr. Mack replied that the plan becomes effective July 1, 1972, assuming that it is approved by the BOR. However, the final draft must be submitted to the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management for its review by March 1, 1972, then submitted to the BOR at least 60 days prior to July 1, 1972.

C. Special Studies: Mr. Phil Clark referred to memorandum from staff dated May 23, 1971, "Special Studies Report" and reported as follows:

(1) Southwest Washington Study: Work has proceeded as planned, and it is hoped that at the next IAC meeting (August) staff would be able to present to and discuss with the Committee some of the study findings about the Southwest Washington area.

(2) Trails: The trails report will be completed and presented to the IAC at its August, 1971 meeting. Presently IAC is working with a group of about sixteen trail-user organizations and land managing agencies to involve them in the development of the final report.

(3) Skagit River Study: A tentative meeting has been set up June 9, 1971, to discuss in detail the Study Plan with the state agencies involved. Mr. Clark mentioned that a letter had been sent by the chairman to the U. S. Forest Service requesting clarification of joint use and identification of the best use of the river. A Forest Service reply is under preparation. A resource inventory will be made of the Skagit River to determine if it meets the criteria for inclusion in the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and the results of this inventory will be discussed with the Committee in August.

(4) Rivers Study: Staff has been working with the Department of Game and other agencies on developing a classification system for the state's rivers. Criteria for identifying sections of the rivers for inclusion within a state system has been coordinated by Mr. Stan Scott of the Department of Game. Mr. Wolf Bauer has been retained by the IAC on a small contract to work with the IAC River Study Committee in defining the classification system to be used.

At the conclusion of Mr. Clark's report, Mr. Scott was asked by the chairman to present his report on rivers. Mr. Scott distributed a 12 page report entitled "A Proposed Streamway Classification and Management System for the State of Washington". Addition of four members to the River Study Committee was reported by Mr. Scott: Bureau of Outdoor Recreation; Commerce and Economic Development Department; Department of Highways and the Department of Ecology. Mr. Scott explained the need for a basic classification system for the State of Washington which should utilize the geologic-hydraulic function and mechanism of rivers as proposed by Mr. Wolf Bauer at the Bremerton IAC meeting, March 1, 1971 (executive session). Six steps toward selecting, inventorying, comparing and prioritizing rivers or segments thereof for the overall study were cited by Mr. Scott:

Initial selection of rivers
Classification
Inventory

Comparison
Consideration of priorities
Designation

His report covered detailed explanation of each of these categories. Mr. Scott described the classification of rivers into the four zones presented by Mr. Bauer: Boulder zone; Floodway; Pastoral and Estuarine. Following the selection of the rivers, the sub-committee will designate certain key criteria in terms of water characteristics, streamway characteristics and recreational use or human use factors. He enlarged upon these guidelines.

Mr. Scott then pointed out that during a period of review and comment, user and special interest groups will be asked to comment on the selection or designation of rivers, or particular portions of rivers, for study. He asked that the Committee review the concept as outlined in the paper, consider the review phase particularly as proposed by the Rivers Study Committee, and express its reactions whether the study group should continue its present program of methodology or whether the Interagency Committee members would like a different or added approach.

Slides were then shown of a comparison of two river basins: Skagit River and Snohomish River (aerial as well as ground views were shown). Mr. Bert Cole complimented Mr. Scott and his committee for the outstanding report. Mr. Bell reiterated this praise and stated a report of this nature is of considerable value not only to the Interagency Committee but to those agencies who are working with the subject of water management and ecology.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MR. CROUSE, THAT WHEREAS THE INITIAL PRESENTATION OF THE RIVERS STUDY COMMITTEE AS PRESENTED IN ITS SUMMARY PAPER ENTITLED "A PROPOSED STREAMWAY CLASSIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON", DATED MAY 21, 1971, IS EXCELLENT, AND

WHEREAS THE MEMBERS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DESIRE TO ENCOURAGE THE RIVERS STUDY COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE ITS APPROACH IN THE STUDY OF THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN DEVELOPING A METHODOLOGY AND GUIDELINES FOR THE IDENTIFICATION, CLASSIFICATION AND PROTECTION OF THE STATES' WILD AND SCENIC AND RECREATIONAL RIVERS; AND

WHEREAS, THE REVIEW PHASE OF THE STUDY BY VARIOUS USER AND SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS IS OF IMPORTANCE TO THE INPUT OF THE STUDY AND HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE RIVERS STUDY COMMITTEE BE DIRECTED TO CONTINUE ITS WORK ON THE RIVERS STUDY IN SUCH MANNER AND DIRECTION AS IT DEEMS APPROPRIATE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

D. Project Status Report: Mr. Robert Lemcke referred to staff memorandum of May 23, 1971, entitled, "Project Status Report", and briefly commented on the four reports attached thereto: Local Agency Status Report; Completed Local Project Report; Current State Agency Project Status Report; and Completed State Agency Project Status Report.

Questions were called for on the various reports. Mr. Bell questioned Airway Heights project and was informed by Mr. Lemcke that it might possibly be withdrawn. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LOFGREN, SECONDED BY MR. BERT COLE, THAT THE FISCAL, PLANNING, SPECIAL STUDIES AND PROJECT STATUS REPORTS BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Fiscal Officer Report: Mr. Bell called upon Mr. Kenn Cole to report on matters within his jurisdiction. Mr. Kenn Cole stated that it was necessary within the next month and a half to attempt to disburse \$3.5 million in order to adhere to the budget estimate made in developing the 1971-73 biennium budget. He suggested local agencies be asked to send in their billings as quickly as possible for processing. Mr. Bell asked the Administrator to contact local agencies by letter and to urge them to submit any outstanding billings.

Interfund loan: Mr. Kenn Cole was then asked for a brief report on the Interfund Loan situation. He stated that the State Finance Committee had notified the IAC it had sold Outdoor Recreation Bonds in the amount of \$10 million at an interest rate of 4.87282 with the cash accruing to the Outdoor Recreation Account on May 19, 1971. The Interfund Loan was, at that point, repaid -- interest on the loan of \$1,200,000 amounted to \$30,844.67, chargeable to the Outdoor Recreation Account. Discussion followed and Mr. Bishop made the point that while the bond proceeds themselves bore this interest, there was an overall advantage to the State through delay of the sale until such time as interest rates were lower.

III State Agencies - Old Business

A. Department of Natural Resources: Mr. Lemcke was asked to present the old business for state agencies.

(1) 1969-71 Recreation Sites Development (IAC #69-710D) - Cost Increase: Mr. Lemcke referred to staff memorandum dated May 23, 1971, entitled "1969-71 Recreation Sites Development (IAC #69-710D) - Cost Increase, Department of Natural Resources" and explained that DNR had requested a cost increase in this overall five site project from \$91,900 to \$99,062. Adjustments to the sites were discussed. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. CROUSE, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' REQUEST FOR A COST INCREASE ON IAC PROJECT #69-710D TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THIS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969; AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE; AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1963, AS AMENDED (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, CHAPTER 43.99, AS AMENDED); THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE, (REFERENDUM 11, CHAPTER 12, LAWS OF 1963, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION, CHAPTER 43.98 RCW) AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE INCREASE IN COST ON IAC PROJECT #69-710D FROM \$91,900 TO \$99,062 IN ACCORD WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' LETTER OF REQUEST DATED APRIL 2, 1971, PROVIDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME.

<u>SITE</u>	<u>PRESENT PROJECT</u>	<u>PROPOSED INCREASE</u>	<u>PROPOSED TOTAL</u>
CORRELL	\$ 12,700	\$ 10,000	\$ 22,700
TARBELL TRAIL	8,000	-0-	8,000
ROCK CREEK	15,000	5,000	20,000
ROCK LAKES	12,700	-0-	12,700
TAYLOR BEACH	43,500 (decrease)	(7,838)	35,662
	<u>\$ 91,900</u>		<u>99,062</u>

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Odegaard commented that this cost increase request pointed out the difficulty being experienced by both state and local agencies in adjusting to accommodate unanticipated differences in development costs.

(2) 1969-71 Development Program (Handicapped Sites) - Cost Increase: Mr. Lemcke referred to staff memorandum entitled "1969-71 Development Program (Handicapped Sites) - Cost Increase, Department of Natural Resources" dated May 23, 1971, and outlined the cost increase involved on the five sites previously approved in the current biennium for DNR. Cost increases on three of the sites (Tanwax Creek, Bratton Canyon and Homestead) had been approved by a telephone poll of the Interagency Committee members on March 15, 1971, and it was necessary for confirming vote of the Committee at this meeting to establish its official action. In addition, DNR was seeking cost increases on two other sites (Snow Cabin and Clover Flats). The higher costs were necessary in the first instance to provide facilities of a higher standard than originally planned, and in the second instance, to meet higher than anticipated construction costs. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' REQUEST FOR COST INCREASES ON THE SNOW CABIN, CLOVER FLATS, TANWAX CREEK, BRATTON CANYON, AND HOMESTEAD SITES TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THIS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969; AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE; AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS; THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, CHAPTER 43.99, AS AMENDED) AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE COST INCREASES ON THE SNOW CABIN, CLOVER FLATS, TANWAX CREEK, BRATTON CANYON, AND HOMESTEAD SITES IN ACCORD WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' LETTER OF REQUEST DATED APRIL 5, 1971, PROVIDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND

CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME.

<u>SITE</u>	<u>REFERENDUM 18</u>	<u>BOR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
SNOW CABIN	\$ 12,838	\$ 12,838	\$ 25,676
CLOVER FLATS	10,000	10,000	20,000
TANWAX CREEK	18,000	18,000	36,000
BRATTON CANYON	18,000	18,000	36,000
HOMESTEAD	18,000	18,000	36,000

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

B. Department of Game: (1) 1969-71 Statewide Water Access - 17 sites: Mr. Lemcke referred to staff memorandum dated May 23, 1971, entitled "1969-71 Statewide Water Access - 17 sites, Department of Game", and called upon Mr. Jack Wayland of the Department of Game to give the presentation. Mr. Wayland called the Committee's attention to an error in description and funding of the Grande Ronde River (Fletcher Property) site, and substituted "Boat Launching site" for the "Parking; shore-fishing; hunting, etc." and substituted "\$28,500 Referendum 215 funds and \$11,500 Referendum 11 funds" for the "\$40,000 Referendum 215" item... (Page 1, Summary of Water Access Sites attached to the memorandum.)

Slides of the sites were shown. Mr. Crouse commented on the Don Wallace, Cowlitz River site, stating the price reflected development costs provided by the owner. He felt the Committee should be aware that development cost is included in the \$50,000 project, much of the development having already been completed by Mr. Wallace. Mrs. Lemere asked Mr. Crouse who owned the middle of the river. Mr. Crouse replied that DNR usually owns the middle of rivers, otherwise the Department of Game also purchases the submerged part of the river with the easement involved. Mr. Crouse then commented on streambank identification signs for fishermen. Mrs. Lemere mentioned the map put out by the Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company did not show available sites of this nature and she felt that it should. Mr. Crouse said that the Department of Game has ten regional offices and people inquire for maps of the immediate area in those offices and that these maps show Department of Game fishing locations. Mr. Bert Cole explained the rules and regulations concerning streambanks and navigable rivers. He suggested the departments coordinate their purchases of property along streambanks and on navigable rivers with his department in order that records of his office will be complete and protect the integrity of the funds as well as the people who use these areas for public purposes. Mr. Bell instructed the Administrator to consult with DNR on these types of projects. Mr. Francis pointed out that the Technical Committee reviews these matters very carefully prior to any action being taken by the IAC on them.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LOFGREN, SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE 17 SITES HEREIN LISTED WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME'S 1969-71 STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THIS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE; AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, CHAPTER 43.99 RCW, AS AMENDED), THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 11, CHAPTER 12, LAWS OF 1963, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION, CHAPTER 43.98 RCW), AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION), SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COMMITTEE HEREBY APPROVES THE ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE OF \$179,175 FOR AN AMENDED PROGRAM AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$606,605 FROM FUNDS IN THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT, AS SET FORTH IN THE FOLLOWING LIST, PROVIDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS OF SAME.

METHOW RIVER	SKYLSTAD	\$ 5,000
METHOW RIVER	AVERILL	400
ENTIAT RIVER	ZERRENNER	3,405
WENATCHEE RIVER	MILLER	990
NACHES RIVER	STAAB	6,000
NACHES RIVER	HAMMERSTAD	29,000
GRANDE RONDE RIVER	FLETCHER	40,000
NOOKSACK RIVER	HIGHWAYS	2,500
N. FORK SKAGIT	KATHMAN	1,800
CHEHALIS RIVER	GOERES	9,500
SATSOP-CHEHALIS RIVER	CLARK	4,250
COWLITZ RIVER	HIGHWAYS	3,200
COWLITZ RIVER	DON WALLACE	50,000
COWLITZ RIVER	HIGHWAYS	1,500
COWLITZ RIVER	WILBER WALLACE	7,780
E. FORK LEWIS RIVER	SANDSTROM	7,500
BEAR RIVER	HIGHWAYS	6,350
		<hr/>
		\$ 179,175

Prior to the question on the motion, Mr. Rottler asked to comment on streambanks and navigable river areas acquired by the Department of Game over the last three or four years. He felt although they did provide good recreational opportunity for certain citizens, many were useable only by very small craft (canoes, kayaks) and did not in any way assist the power boater. He emphasized the Committee would be approving approximately \$65,000 or 10 to 15 percent of the annual flow of funds for Initiative 215 and though he was in accord with the Game Department's program, he felt the Committee should spend an additional portion of 215 funds for feasible, significant and useable properties which would primarily assist the powered vessel users so that these users would get their fair share of Initiative 215 monies. Mr. Bell asked that staff

having heard Mr. Rottler's comments should take them into consideration in future funding. Question was then called for on the motion and IT WAS CARRIED.

(2) 1969-71 Freshwater Shorelands Development: Memorandum from staff dated May 23, 1971, entitled "Freshwater Shorelands Development - Department of Game", was then referred to by Mr. Lemcke. Five separate Freshwater shorelands development projects were reviewed by the use of slides shown by Mr. Lemcke. The sites were: Desert Wildlife Recreation Area; Boggans Oasis; Chehalis River; Lower Methow River; and Fishing Floats. Mr. Bell noted the fishing docks in the Everett area were becoming very well used, particularly Mukilteo, and he was glad to see this type of program being funded.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME'S PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP CERTAIN PROJECTS IDENTIFIED AS THE DESERT WILDLIFE RECREATION AREA, BOGGAN'S OASIS, CHEHALIS RIVER, LOWER METHOW RIVER, AND FISHING FLOATS TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969; AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE; AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED, AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE EXPENDITURE OF \$55,000, DISTRIBUTED AS FOLLOWS:

DESERT WILDLIFE RECREATION AREA	\$ 13,900)	
BOGGAN'S OASIS	12,100)	
CHEHALIS RIVER	10,000)	\$ 55,000
LOWER METHOW RIVER	9,000)	
FISHING FLOATS	10,000)	

PROVIDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF SAME.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

C. Parks and Recreation Commission: (1) 1969-71 Puget Sound Boating Access: Mr. Lemcke then referred to staff memorandum dated May 23, 1971, entitled "Cornet Bay Development - State Parks and Recreation Commission".

(a) Cornet Bay Development: Slides of the Cornet Bay area were shown. \$56,490

was requested by the Parks and Recreation Commission to rebuild and expand the existing facilities to permit launching of boats at all tides. The project will provide four deep water launching lanes and approximately 150 parking stalls. Mr. Lemcke stated the project would be funded entirely from Initiative 215 monies in Parks' Puget Sound Boating Access Program. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT

WHEREAS THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S PROPOSAL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CORNET BAY TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THIS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE, AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, 43.99 RCW, AS AMENDED), SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE EXPENDITURE OF \$56,490 FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CORNET BAY PROVIDED THAT THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME.

(b) Saddlebag Island: Memorandum of staff dated May 23, 1971, entitled "Saddlebag Island, State Parks and Recreation Commission" was referred to by Mr. Lemcke. Slides of the project were shown. The joint application proposal by the State Parks and Recreation Commission and Skagit County was explained by Mr. Lemcke. Total cost of the island was estimated at \$125,000. The proposed funding schedule was to provide 25% of the cost from State Parks' share of Initiative 215 funds available from its current biennium Puget Sound Boating Access Program and 75% to come from the local agency share of the Outdoor Recreation Account -- presumably Initiative 215 or a combination of 215 and Referendum 18. No cash contribution would be made by Skagit County. Title to this island would rest with the State Parks and Recreation Commission, which would also develop, maintain and operate the island. Title would revert to Skagit County in the event State Parks discontinued maintenance and operation of the site.

Mr. Francis referred to the staff memorandum and explained ownership of the tidelands. He stated though staff recognized the merits of Saddlebag Island as a desirable acquisition to serve boaters, it was staff feeling the following points should be taken into consideration by the Committee:

- (1) Skagit County did not include acquisition of Saddlebag Island in its Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan and there was also no current appraisal on the property available, other than a Parks' staff update of the original appraisal. The status of current negotiations with the owner was unknown by IAC staff.
- (2) Saddlebag Island is a destination site and the State Park and Recreation Commission's Puget Sound Boating Access Program was specifically approved to

provide launching access to Puget Sound. Thus it was felt the funding from this program was not appropriate, unless the program was amended to include destination sites.

- (3) There were many unanswered questions concerning Saddlebag Island at the Technical Review meeting for State projects held prior to the IAC meeting. These questions were enumerated by Mr. Francis.
- (4) The local agency representatives of the Technical Committee did not have an opportunity to review the project and could well have input regarding the questions raised concerning it.

Though staff agreed the project was most commendable from the standpoint of use by recreationists and boaters and there was merit to the principle of joint applications, it was suggested by the IAC staff that the project be reviewed with the full Technical Committee for the purpose of formulating a policy recommendation to the Committee on joint applications. Thus, staff recommended that any action on Saddlebag Island be deferred at the meeting.

Mr. Francis then commented on his meetings with Representative Berentson regarding the acquisition of the island as well as meetings with the State Parks and Recreation Commission staff concerning it. Though he was interested and enthusiastic about the joint endeavor as Administrator of the IAC, it was discovered as the project progressed that the local agency was actually playing a very passive role and State Parks was the active participant. Mr. Francis felt guidelines concerning joint applications of this nature should be formed within the next three months and presented at the August meeting for consideration of the IAC.

Mr. Bert Cole asked Mr. Odegaard for his opinions. Mr. Odegaard stated that every one of the points broached by the Administrator could be taken in a positive or negative direction depending upon reasons for wanting to do so. In reply to the points raised by the staff of IAC, he pointed out that:

- (1) The IAC had been formed six or seven years ago to preserve lands for outdoor recreational purposes and that Saddlebag Island met all of the requirements and should be preserved;
- (2) Local agencies are not using Initiative 215 monies as rapidly as could be possible and there is therefore a backlog of funds available;
- (3) State Parks recognizes the need for destination points for boaters and will be looking toward this type of program;
- (4) Costs have been shifted for the Department of Natural Resources and the same consideration should be given to the Saddlebag Island proposal;
- (5) Skagit County did not have the money to acquire the Island. (Mr. Odegaard read a letter from Arnold Hansen, Skagit County Commissioner, clarifying this point.) Since Skagit County did not have the staff of King, Pierce, Spokane or other larger counties, it had asked for assistance in the overall planning.
- (6) Though Saddlebag Island was not included in the Skagit County Comprehensive Plan it has been in the State Parks and Recreation Commission plans for recreational areas for quite some time;

- (7) An appraisal had been done by a competent firm in Seattle on Saddlebag Island; however a current appraisal had not been completed prior to consideration of the island by the IAC;
- (8) The owner did not wish to be contacted until State Parks and Skagit County were ready to proceed;
- (9) State Parks and Recreation Commission could "switch funds" and place monies in a boater destination program if necessary;
- (10) IAC has asked that agencies have cooperative programs and Saddlebag Island would be ideal.

Mr. Odegaard then commented on fiscal responsibility stating the local agency simply did not have the funds for this acquisition and that it was possible for the state to step in and acquire the island through use of Initiative 215 and Referendum 18 funds.

The value of Saddlebag Island as a destination point for boaters was mentioned by Mr. Rottler. He felt there were dormant Initiative 215 funds available which could be used but he questioned the technical points involved in their use. Mr. Francis agreed there were dormant 215 funds but pointed out Monday's IAC meeting (May 24, 1971) would include presentation of four or five local agency marine projects which would utilize these funds. Mr. Ward asked how Saddlebag Island would have been ranked with the other projects being presented. Mr. Lemcke stated that while it had not been ranked, it would probably rank high. Mr. Francis stated staff was not concerned with the merits of Saddlebag Island but with the funding proposal and the guidelines necessary for joint ventures.

Mr. Bell brought out the fact that if the project were to be funded as proposed, the Committee would in effect be taking 75% of the local funds and purchasing lands for the State Parks and Recreation Commission, thereby depleting by that much the local agency monies. He expressed his concern that there did not appear to be an expression on the part of the majority of the Skagit County commissioners as to acquisition of the island and the proposed funding; that there should have been a resolution enacted by that Body. Mr. Odegaard stated such a resolution signed by all the commissioners was on file with the IAC. Mr. Bell then questioned the legality of using local funds to acquire a state project. He further stated that the acquisition of Saddlebag Island would not be within State Parks' boating access program since it was in effect a destination project. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. WARD, THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE THE REQUEST OF THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION FOR ITS JOINT APPLICATION REQUEST WITH THE COUNTY OF SKAGIT TO ACQUIRE SADDLEBAG ISLAND, AND, FURTHER, THAT THE COMMITTEE APPROVE THE TRANSFER OF 25% OF THE COST OF SADDLEBAG ISLAND FROM ITS PUGET SOUND AND ADJACENT WATERS ACCESS PROGRAM FOR THIS PARTICULAR DESTINATION PURPOSE.

Mr. Crouse inquired whether the funding would remain the same. The reply was in the affirmative and Mr. Crouse then stated his concurrence with the staff that the joint application procedure should be carefully explored and a policy set concerning these areas. He, too, felt there was a legal question involved in the use of local monies to fund what would ultimately be a state project. The desirability of acquiring Saddlebag Island either as a state or local project was emphasized by Mr. Bishop. However, he felt authorization to make local funds available for use in state projects should be sought from the State Legislature.

In response to a question from Mr. Bert Cole, Mr. Francis said the local agency representatives on the Technical Committee had not had a chance to review the Saddlebag Island project proposal. Mr. Cole suggested their input be obtained and that they have a chance to review it and its complexities. It was pointed out by Mr. Ward that Skagit County is in financial straits and did need assistance for this type of project. It was his opinion staff should have identified the more positive aspects of the project and presented alternatives to the Committee for its review. Mrs. Lemere then asked Mr. Odegaard if the project had been considered as a State project without involving Skagit County. He replied that it had and explained the General Funding situation of the State Parks and Recreation Commission in the line-itemmed projects through 1971-73. Flexibility, he said, could be obtained through the Puget Sound and Adjacent Waters program and that his department had been working with the Interclub of Washington concerning a listing of needs for boaters in the State of Washington. He felt cooperative programs should be encouraged in acquiring land for recreational purposes. A definite need for Saddlebag Island had been confirmed in working with boater groups, but the Parks and Recreation Commission did not have sufficient funds to complete the transaction. Thus, the cooperative venture between State Parks and Skagit County had been evolved.

Mr. Bishop felt approval at this time by the Committee to acquire Saddlebag Island would set a precedent of funding joint local-state projects and in effect Saddlebag Island would be a state project when completed. Mr. Odegaard stated if the project had been presented to the IAC by Skagit County only and State Parks had then agreed to assist with 25% of its funds, it would have been considered by the staff and the Committee. Mr. Bishop stated the difference would have been that the IAC staff would have had a chance to review it and rank it along with other local projects.

Mr. Odegaard reiterated his concern that recreation land would be lost if Saddlebag Island were not acquired soon. He was in favor of considering the project with other local projects if this would be necessary to acquire the land. Mr. Rottler expressed his disappointment that staff and the agencies involved had not been able to come to the IAC with a more positive statement on Saddlebag Island. He asked if there could not be some alternate solution to the problem, granting the fact that it was necessary to have policy and rules and regulations followed. He suggested an amendment of the Skagit County Park and Recreation Comprehensive Plan to provide for the acquisition. The need for a current appraisal was again mentioned by Mr. Francis who stated this was standard procedure within the IAC. The chairman asked for the question on the motion proposed by Mr. Odegaard. THOSE VOTING FOR THE MOTION WERE MRS. LEMERE, MR. WARD AND MR. ODEGAARD. THE MOTION FAILED FOR LACK OF A MAJORITY.

Mrs. Blaisdell was recognized by the Chairman. She pointed out her concerns with review of state and local projects and asked that the local representatives of the Technical Committee be allowed to sit in on the review of state projects. The Chairman agreed this should be done and so instructed the staff.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WARD, SECONDED BY MR. ROTTLER THAT THE IAC STAFF MEET IN THE EVENING (SUNDAY, MAY 23) TO DISCUSS HOW ACQUISITION OF SADDLEBAG ISLAND COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED CONSISTENT WITH IAC POLICIES AND GUIDELINES, AND PRESENT ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE ON MONDAY, MAY 24, FOR CONSIDERATION.

Mr. Francis asked if the meeting would include state and local Technical Committee members. Though the motion was not officially amended, Mr. Francis directed that the Technical Committee would meet with staff at 8:00 p.m. Sunday evening, May 23rd, to discuss

recommendations concerning Saddlebag Island's acquisition.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV State Agencies - New Business

A. State Agencies - 1971-73 Action Program: Mr. Francis referred to staff memorandum dated May 23, 1971, entitled "State Agency Action Program - 71-73 Biennium", and reviewed the state agency action program and its administration for the 1971-73 biennium. He pointed out that this was an update of the state agency action program as presented and approved at the May 1970 IAC meeting. Tables concerning appropriated funding level of the state agencies involved in the IAC program were referred to: Table I, Appropriated Funding Level; Table II, Estimated Funding Level. Other tables referred to included: Summary of State Agency Action Program by area type (Table III), and Tables IV, V, and VI, regional and area type funding of the three state agencies concerned (Game, DNR and Parks and Recreation Commission respectively). Reappropriated funds were not included in the action program at this time but will be developed later following consultation with the state agencies. Figures given the Committee by Mr. Francis were as follows:

<u>Game Department</u>	Acquisition	\$ 3,357,331		
	Development	<u>1,181,016</u>	Total	\$ 4,538,347
<u>Department</u>	Acquisition	\$ 732,218		
<u>Natural Resources</u>	Development	<u>1,033,454</u>	Total	\$ 1,765,672
<u>Parks and Recreation</u>	Acquisition	\$ 2,643,186		
<u>Commission</u>	Development	<u>4,099,350</u>	Total	\$ 6,742,536

This being an informative report, Mr. Francis stated that no formal action by the Committee was necessary.

B. Department of Natural Resources

(1) 1971-73 Biennium Program Presentation: The Chairman called upon Mr. Al O'Donnell for presentation of the Department of Natural Resources' 1971-73 Biennium Program. Mr. O'Donnell introduced Mr. Charles Butler and Mr. Donald Boyd of DNR. A closed circuit television film was shown depicting accomplishments in the Capitol Forest area and contemplated work in the Sultan Basin.

(2) Sultan Basin Scenic Road - Development: Mr. Lemcke referred to staff memorandum dated May 23, 1971, entitled "Sultan Basin Scenic Road - Department of Natural Resources". Approval of 7.53 miles of road in the Sultan Basin Pilchuck Loop System (new construction and betterment work) was asked by DNR in the amount of \$225,000. Following explanation of the project, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' REQUEST

FOR ROAD CONSTRUCTION AND BETTERMENT WORK ON THE SULTAN BASIN SCENIC ROAD SYSTEM TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THIS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969; AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE; AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, CHAPTER 43.99, AS AMENDED); AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE CONSTRUCTION OR BETTERMENT OF 7.53 MILES OF ROAD IN THE SULTAN BASIN AT A TOTAL COST OF \$394,600 (INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE SHARE \$225,000) IN ACCORD WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' LETTER OF REQUEST DATED APRIL 9, 1971, PROVIDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(3) 1971-73 Recreation Sites Development - 6 Sites: Mr. Lemcke referred to memorandum of staff dated May 23, 1971, entitled "1971-73 Recreation Sites Development - 6 Sites - Department of Natural Resources". DNR requested approval of six sites as follows: Cottonwood, Sandwich Creek, Sheep Creek, Tahuya River, Green Mt. Vista, and Greider Mt. Vista. Mr. Lloyd Bell was asked to show slides of the various areas. Mr. Crouse expressed his concern about boat traffic on a creek the size of Sandwich Creek. He asked that DNR discuss this with his staff. There was some discussion on cost of planning performed by DNR staff being included in the overall expenditure involved on the sites. Mr. Odegaard inquired whether those employees performing the planning task were on DNR "in-service" staff. He was informed that they were, but the costs were considered eligible since these people were not paid from the General Fund but were hired from the capital appropriation of DNR and were paid through a capital offset account. Following discussion, it was consensus of the Committee that the Administrator investigate this program as well as force account matters and present guidelines at the August IAC meeting. Mr. Bell stated there was no relationship between force account and the capital offset account, but there was need for guidelines in these matters. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' REQUEST FOR \$211,000 FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF SIX RECREATION SITES UNDER ITS 1971-73 BIENNIUM PROGRAM TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THIS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969; AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY

SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE; AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS; THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, CHAPTER 43.99, RCW, AS AMENDED) AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE DEVELOPMENT OF COTTONWOOD, SANDWICH CREEK, SHEEP CREEK, TAHUYA RIVER, GREEN MOUNTAIN, AND GREIDER MOUNTAIN SITES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$211,000 IN ACCORD WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES' LETTER OF REQUEST DATED APRIL 2, 1971, PROVIDED THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME, AND PROVIDED FURTHER THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES WILL DISCUSS WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME THE BOATING ASPECTS ON THE SANDWICH CREEK SITE.

<u>SITE</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	
COTTONWOOD	\$ 25,000)
SANDWICH CREEK	29,000)
SHEEP CREEK	66,000)
TAHUYA RIVER	21,000)
GREEN MT. VISTA	60,000)
GREIDER MT. VISTA	10,000)
		\$ 211,000

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

C. Department of Game

(1) 1971-73 Biennium Program Presentation: Mr. Lemcke asked Mr. Jack Wayland to present the 1971-73 biennium program of the Department of Game. Mr. Wayland stated that since the inception of the water access program, 480 access sites on lakes and streams had been provided by the Department of Game. The SCORP identifies the need for 400 additional sites, and since 1965 the Department has acquired 142 sites or approximately 35% of this need through the IAC program. 397 miles of streambank easement had been provided by the department but 250 additional miles were identified as needed. Acquisition of 140,000 feet in fee and 300,000 feet in streambank easements, or approximately 33% of the need has been accomplished through the IAC. In addition to the acquisition program, the Department of Game has spent \$1,000,000 in the development of boating areas including 60 boat launching sites and for its freshwater development program. Mr. Wayland stated current ownership of land by the Department of Game throughout the state is 600,000 acres with an additional need for 630,000 acres. He thanked the Committee and the staff for their considerations in the past biennium. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT (1) THE L. T. MURRAY WILDLIFE RECREATION AREA, STAGE III, (2) THE STILLWATER WILDLIFE RECREATION AREA, STAGE II, AND (3) 20 BOAT LAUNCHING SITES AS REVIEWED IN STAFF MEMORANDA DATED MAY 23, 1971, BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE L. T. MURRAY, STAGE III PROJECT, THE STILLWATER WILDLIFE RECREATION AREA, STAGE II, ACQUISITION PROPOSAL AND THE FISCAL YEAR 1972 BOAT LAUNCHING DEVELOPMENT PROJECT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME, TO BE CONSISTENT

(continued)

<u>REGION</u>	<u>SITE</u>	<u>COST</u>
XII	None	--
✓XIII	Walla Walla River	<u>5,000.00</u>
	Total	\$ 362,773.00
	Contingency	<u>33,177.50</u>
		\$ 395,890.50

Discussion followed. Mr. Bishop remarked that the L. T. Murray site was a tremendous purchase and he would hope there would be interagency cooperation in providing areas for recreationists and park development. Mr. Crouse concurred. Both Mr. Odegaard and Mr. Cole said they would be pleased to cooperate in developing projects when asked to do so. Mr. Lemcke then explained the need for a change in the Region VI site, and substituted 3 sites for the one on the list. MR. BERT COLE AMENDED THE MOTION TO ELIMINATE "COLUMBIA RIVER, WHITE ISLAND" FROM THE LISTING OF BOAT LAUNCHING SITES AND SUBSTITUTING THE WASHOUGAL RIVER AND TWO SITES ON THE KLICKITAT, WITH COST REMAINING THE SAME (\$50,000).

<u>REGION</u>	<u>SITE</u>	<u>COST</u>
VI	Washougal River	} \$ 50,000.00
	Klickitat River (2 sites)	

MR. LOFGREN SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

Mr. Rottler then inquired what portion of the \$200,000 reappropriation of the Game Department's allocation for the biennium would be provided by Initiative 215 funds. Mr. Clark explained this had not been worked out in the final planning. At this point, Mr. Odegaard asked that the source of funding be identified on Game and DNR projects the same as for projects approved for the State Parks and Recreation Commission. Mr. Bishop asked if it would be difficult to identify the source from which the state projects will be funded at this particular juncture. Mr. Clark replied there should be flexibility in administering these programs between funds. However, Mr. Bishop felt the source of funds should be identified in each case. The Chairman concurred and asked that this be done for all state agency projects in the future.

MR. ODEGAARD CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON THE AMENDED MOTION AND THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

D. Parks and Recreation Commission

(1) 1971-73 Biennium Program Presentation: Mr. Odegaard was called upon for the Parks and Recreation Commission presentation on the 1971-73 Biennium Program and, in turn, called upon Mr. Bill Bush. A very fine narrated slide program was presented giving examples of the overall State Parks and Recreation Commission's program. In addition to the usual acquisition and development activities of State Parks, other facets of their program were viewed such as resident youth camps, handicapped sites, historic sites, interpretive facilities, etc. Mr. Bush also added that 35 islands in the San Juan group had been added to the State Parks and Recreation Commission's inventory.

Reference was then made to staff memorandum of May 23, 1971, entitled "1971-73 Biennium Development Projects - State Parks and Recreation Commission.

(2) 1971-73 Biennium Development Projects - Seven specific projects were presented to the Committee:

Jones Beach	\$ 354,149	Walter Daniels	\$ 333,766
Fort Canby	1,065,207	Potholes	485,970
Fort Worden	235,619	Wanapum	259,808
Blake Island	532,059		

It was explained that four of the seven projects (Walter Daniels, Fort Canby, Potholes, and Wanapum) included costs for administrative complexes totaling \$163,064. The policy of the IAC has been that such costs are ineligible. However, the inclusion of the sites and their related costs were placed in the Governor's 1971-73 Capital Budget by the Office of Program Planning and Fiscal Management. The staff of IAC recognized both the need to provide these facilities and the inability of the State to provide funds from the General Fund. Therefore, it was brought to the IAC members' attention that staff though not recommending against funding of the complexes was adhering to its policy of not funding administrative complexes for future projects. Mr. Lemcke noted, further, that \$8,000 had been included in the Potholes project for a ranger's residence. Since this project had not been line-itemed in the budget, staff recommended the \$8,000 remain in the project but not be used to complete the residence. The funds will be used for other identified facilities in the project.

Discussion followed and included concern over development costs on projects. Mr. Francis reported on his recent effort to obtain information on development costs. A letter has been sent to the State Liaison Officers to determine what other states are doing about average costs. Mr. Odegaard stated his department had booklets on costs on almost all kinds of development which his department could send to the IAC staff for review. The Chairman asked the IAC staff to obtain these. There was then some discussion on the Seacoast Management Act and its impact on projects involving water-oriented areas. Blake Island was discussed. Mr. Bert Cole said the new seacoast law sets up very specific time periods for hearings and for coordination with local governments. It was his feeling some projects may be delayed quite awhile during negotiations on factors involved in the seacoast management law. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S PROPOSED 1971-73 BIENNIUM DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (JONES BEACH, FORT CANBY, FORT WORDEN, BLAKE ISLAND, WALTER DANIELS, POTHOLE, AND WANAPUM) TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATE-WIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THIS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

WHEREAS, THE COMMITTEE FINDS THAT THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION HAS COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAS SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE, AND

WHEREAS, SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COSTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FEDERAL LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND; THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, 43.99 RCW, AS AMENDED),

AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE DEVELOPMENT OF SEVEN STATE PARKS UNDER THEIR 1971-73 BIENNIUM PROGRAM:

JONES BEACH	\$ 354,149
FORT CANBY	1,065,207
FORT WORDEN	235,619
BLAKE ISLAND	532,059
WALTER DANIELS	333,766
POTHOLES	485,970
WANAPUM	259,808
	<hr/>
	\$ 3,266,578

WITH THE PROVISIO THAT NO COSTS FOR COMPLETION OF THE RANGER'S RESIDENCE AT POTHOLES STATE PARK BE ALLOWED; AND PROVIDED THAT THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The meeting recessed for the evening at 4:00 p.m., the Chairman stating it would be called to order again the following morning at 9:00 a.m. (Monday, May 24).

MONDAY

MAY 24, 1971

9:00 A.M.

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m., a quorum (10) being present.

Saddlebag Island: Memorandum dated May 24, 1971, entitled "Saddlebag Island, Parks and Recreation Commission", was read to the Committee, it being the result of the meeting of the Technical Committee on the evening of May 23, 1971. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MR. BISHOP

THAT THE STATE PARKS PUGET SOUND BOATING ACCESS PROGRAM BE AMENDED TO PROVIDE FOR THE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF BOATING DESTINATION SITES, TO BE KNOWN AS THE "STATE PARKS PUGET SOUND BOATING ACCESS AND DESTINATION PROGRAM."

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE ACQUISITION OF SADDLEBAG ISLAND BE CONSIDERED A STATE PARKS' PROJECT AND BE APPROVED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$125,000, TO BE FUNDED THROUGH THE USE OF 50% INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS FROM STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S PUGET SOUND BOATING ACCESS AND DESTINATION PROGRAM AND 50% FROM STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION'S SHARE OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Committee also noted the recommendation of the Technical Committee that the subject of cooperative projects involving both State and local agencies be thoroughly investigated and discussed by the full IAC Technical Committee with a report to be submitted

to the IAC at the August, 1971 meeting.

V. Local Projects - Old Business

A. Uniform Relocation Assistance: Memorandum of staff dated May 23, 1971 was referred to by Mr. Francis and explanation as noted therein was given to the Committee members.

Mr. Francis reported that on January 2, 1971 the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, Public Law 91-646, became effective and applicable to all Federal agencies and to all state and local agencies acquiring lands with Federal assistance. States receiving federal assistance must agree to participate in this program as soon as their laws permit, but in no case later than July 1, 1972. Substitute Senate Bill 770 in the 1971 Washington State Legislative Session sets up relocation payments procedure and relocation assistance as stipulated in Public Law 91-646. All state and local agencies receiving federal funds must comply with the provisions of the Act, and Senate Bill 770 makes it mandatory for local agencies to provide relocation assistance only when federal funds are involved, and optional when not receiving any federal assistance. However, in the absence of such federal funds, the IAC must establish policy on meeting relocation costs. Even though the state law will not require local agencies to pay these costs, the IAC will be required to do so. It will therefore be necessary in order that the IAC not be responsible for 100% relocation costs that local project funding approval require local agencies to assume their proportional share of the relocation costs.

It was further pointed out that prior to July 1, 1972, projects approved for federal assistance will include relocation costs as part of the project total. Previously all relocation costs paid by HUD came from a separate account and the BOR did not provide any funds for relocation. The Federal agency involved will pay the full amount of the first \$25,000 of each individual relocation prior to July 1, 1972. After July 1, 1972 these costs will be built into the project and assumed by the federal, state and local agencies through the normal funding procedure. Mr. Francis said that insofar as implementation of this program was concerned it was expected that guidelines could be presented to the Committee at the August 1971 meeting for approval. It was his feeling the relocation assistance program could have a very serious impact on the IAC -- perhaps costing as much as \$4 to \$6 million. The program, being retroactive, would cover any incomplete projects regardless of the date approved if relocation was involved.

Mr. Bell mentioned it would be necessary then to look at state projects which have condemnation proceedings within them. Mr. Francis explained that relocation costs would not be limited to condemnation projects but to all projects. Mr. Bell asked that staff obtain more information on the relocation assistance program prior to the August meeting for review of the Committee. Mr. Crouse expressed his concern at the estimate given by Mr. Francis as to program cost and felt it would be possible to research this and come up with a lower figure. He did not feel the impact of the program would be as great as the Administrator thought.

Mr. David Towne, Seattle Park and Recreation Department, was then recognized by the Chairman. He stated he would be glad to send to the IAC members a report he had requested from the Relocation Property Manager on relocation assistance. Mr. Putnam

remarked there were 15 or 16 previously approved projects involved in relocation assistance. At this point, Mr. Bell suggested it would be well to obtain from the Attorney General a voluntary waiver agreement for use by the IAC in relocation matters. There followed discussion as to the propriety of this approach and the matter was not acted upon.

B. Cost Increases: (1) Meadowdale - Snohomish County: Mr. Lemcke referred to memorandum of staff dated May 23, 1971, and explained the cost increase request of Snohomish County for its Meadowdale project in the amount of \$8,008. This amount will allow parcel substitutions requested by the County as well as allow for current appraised value on all of the parcels involved. Total project cost would go from \$465,176 to \$497,210...IAC share from \$116,294 to \$124,302. Staff recommended approval. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BISHOP, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT THE ADDITIONAL \$8,008 BE ALLOCATED TO SNOHOMISH COUNTY FOR ITS MEADOWDALE PROJECT. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(2) Havermale Island 2A - City of Spokane - Cost Increase: Mr. Lemcke referred to staff memorandum dated May 23, 1971, and stated it was staff's recommendation that the Committee approve a cost increase from \$517,900 to \$737,000 based on a more recent higher formal appraisal than the preliminary appraisal used at the time of project approval. The 25% share (IAC) would be increased from \$129,425 to \$184,250, an increase of \$54,825. There followed considerable discussion concerning the land to be used by Expo 74 on Havermale Island. Mr. Odegaard felt that plans for constructing buildings on Havermale Island by Expo 74 should be determined and weighed carefully to insure that recreation land would not be used for Expo 74 purposes without negotiations being made for trade of other land nearby. Mr. Bell warned that the Committee is not obligated in any way to make these transfers of land. If the lands purchased through IAC for recreation purposes are involved, a land trade transaction could be made but the City of Spokane would need to take the proper legal steps. Speaking for the City of Spokane, Mr. William Fearn, Director, Department Parks and Recreation, said the city would live up to its signed agreement with the IAC. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. COLE THAT THE ADDITIONAL \$54,825 BE ALLOCATED TO THE CITY OF SPOKANE FOR ITS HAVERMALE ISLAND PHASE 2A PROJECT. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(3) Kitsap County (Wildcat Lake) Cost Increase: Staff memorandum of May 24, 1971, was referred to by Mr. Pratt. This project when approved included HUD funds and on January 15, 1971, that agency notified the County of Kitsap that the project had been denied because of a lack of available funds. Staff therefore recommended an increase of \$59,750 with IAC assuming a funding level of 75%. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LOFGREN, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT THE ADDITIONAL \$59,750 BE ALLOCATED TO THE COUNTY OF KITSAP FOR ITS WILDCAT LAKE PROJECT. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(4) City of Mercer Island, Request for Cost Increase: Mr. Glenn Moore referred to staff memorandum dated May 24, 1971, stating staff recommended an increase of \$68,426 in the City of Mercer Island's project. A combination of reduction in total cost at the time of original approval and delays in obtaining permission to initiate construction ultimately resulted in a higher bid cost on this project. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WARD, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT THE ADDITIONAL \$68,426 BE ALLOCATED TO THE CITY OF MERCER ISLAND FOR ITS CITY PARK PROJECT. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(5) City of Spokane - Rochester Park Development - Cost Increase: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated May 24, 1971, and stated staff was recommending an increase of \$6,000 on this project to provide for construction of a wading pool. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BERT COLE, SECONDED BY MR. ROTTLER THAT THE ADDITIONAL \$6,000 BE ALLOCATED TO THE CITY OF SPOKANE FOR ITS ROCHESTER PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

(6) City of Seattle (Elliott Bay) Cost Increase: Staff memorandum of May 23, 1971, was referred to by Mr. Pratt concerning a cost increase for Elliott Bay. This project proposed the acquisition of approximately 4.1 acres of tidelands, contained in two parcels, including more than 1700 feet of frontage on Elliott Bay. The City of Seattle requested a total project increase of \$713,000 based on court awards for the two parcels. This would increase the total project from \$660,000 to \$1,373,000. Staff recommended a cost increase to the value of the formal appraisal (\$756,750) (IAC share of 25% to be \$189,187.50 rather than \$165,000 -- or a total increase of \$24,187.50).

Staff felt the preliminary appraisal had not been realistic. However, the court award represented an excessive cost in terms of the recreational value of the project to the people of the State as a whole. It was doubtful if the project would have been recommended to the Committee for funding as a new project at the \$1,373,000 level. There followed considerable discussion. MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT THE CITY OF SEATTLE, ELLIOTT BAY PROJECT COST INCREASE OF \$178,250 BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE.

Questions were then asked of the City of Seattle as to tideland ownership, proposed construction (Marine View Drive) and possible HUD funding. Mr. David Towne, City of Seattle, replied to the questions and the HUD representative responded stating it might be possible during the new fiscal year to consider HUD funding. Mr. Bishop suggested such funding be explored by the City of Seattle. It was the consensus that the City of Seattle was paying an excessive price for the property; however, Mr. Odegaard pointed out that in condemnation proceedings there will naturally be added costs but that these should not be considered as excessive if the value of the land is there having been established by court order. He stated local agencies are asked to pursue their projects, attempt to get options, and despite the fact whether they accept the court award or not, agencies still must pay court costs and yet receive no land. Mr. Francis stated any local agency has the option to withdraw a project but if they have begun purchasing procedures, they have to complete it. Question was called for on the motion.

MR. ODEGAARD AND MRS. LEMERE VOTED "YES". THE MAJORITY OF THE COMMITTEE VOTED "NO" AND THE MOTION WAS DEFEATED.

MR. CROUSE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ALLOCATING AN ADDITIONAL \$24,187.50 TO THE CITY OF SEATTLE FOR ITS ELLIOTT BAY PROJECT. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Odegaard then requested that the IAC staff direct itself to a study of condemnation procedures and the IAC policy currently in use. Mr. Towne stated that since the project had been turned down by the Committee because of excessive condemnation costs, he hoped some criteria would be evolved concerning such matters for local agencies.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA: (1) Authority of Administrator
(2) Meeting Date

(1) Authority of Administrator: It was MOVED BY MR. LOFGREN THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR BE GIVEN THE SAME DISCRETION IN INCREASING BY TEN PERCENT (10%) THE COSTS OF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AS HAS BEEN GIVEN HIM IN THE CASE OF THE COST OF ACQUISITION PROJECTS (SEE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 24, 1970, PAGE 9, PARAGRAPH 4).

There was no second to this motion. Mr. Bell suggested the guidelines on this subject be in written form for the August meeting. Mr. Lofgren therefore WITHDREW HIS MOTION with the understanding that staff would prepare guidelines for review of the Committee.

(2) Meeting date - August: Mr. Bell suggested the meeting for August, 1971 be changed to the Ilwaco or Long Beach area, August 22-23-24, with a work session scheduled for the afternoon of August 22 (Sunday). IT WAS MOVED BY MR. CROUSE, SECONDED BY MR. BERT COLE THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR ARRANGE FOR THE MEETING IN EITHER ILWACO, LONG BEACH, OR SOME OTHER OCEAN BEACH CITY. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

VI Local Projects - New Business

A. Local Action Program 1971-73 Biennium: Mr. Francis was called upon to present the Local Action Program. He referred to memorandum of staff dated May 23, 1971, entitled "Local Agency Action Program - 1971-73 Biennium", and read portions of it. Slides were shown of the various tables referred to in the memorandum:

Table I	Appropriated Funding Level (by the Legislature)
Table II	Estimated Funding Level (including additional LWCF funds anticipated to become available over and above the level of the appropriation).

Mr. Francis stated \$2,849,559 was appropriated under LWCF; with a total of \$4,866,555 anticipated as in Table II. He then cited page 3 of the memorandum and read the six points given as to why grants should not be approved solely on the basis of need identified in the State Plan, proportionally distributing monies between area types and regions. Thus, staff has recommended a modified action program during the course of 1971-73 biennium and has asked that the Committee recognize the need for flexibility in its administration. The flexibility in administering the Action Program should extend to modification in funding levels within and between both area types and regions, but under no circumstances extend to funding projects for which needs are not identified in SCORP.

Mr. Francis recommended (page 4 of the memorandum) a policy for the IAC to follow in administering conformance to the local agency action program: Carefully weigh the rationale for originally developing the action program in distributing the funds and recognizing that circumstances may arise which justify exceeding area type and regional allocations in some instances. Exceeding these allocations will mean that funds will have to be pulled from other regions to accommodate any increases, so it is important that any project which exceeds a region's total allocation must be weighed very carefully as to its merits in comparison with opportunities foregone in other regions. As new projects are recommended for approval throughout the biennium, staff will keep the Committee apprised on their conformance to the action program.

The orderly distribution of such funds was explained through use of a "funding formula". The following maximum allocations were suggested by staff:

"FUNDING FORMULA"

<u>Meeting</u>	<u>Total allocation</u>	
May '71, 1st meeting	\$ 4,000,000	
2nd meeting	2,574,878	
3rd meeting	1,287,439	
4th meeting	<u>1,287,438</u>	
Sub-Total FY 72	\$ 9,149,755	\$ 9,149,755
May '72, 5th meeting	\$ 2,137,400	
6th meeting	2,137,400	
7th meeting	-0-	
8th meeting	<u>-0-</u>	
Sub-Total FY 73	\$ 4,274,800	<u>\$ 4,274,800</u>
Grand Total 71/73 biennium		\$ 13,424,555

As further guidelines for action program administration, staff recommended the following:

- (1) A minimum of \$50,000 would be reserved until the 6th meeting for each region in an attempt to encourage applications from the various geographical areas.
- (2) Attempt will be made to effect an approximate 50-50 split between acquisition and development projects.
- (3) Fund sources must be kept in proper balance to utilize Federal funds.
- (4) BOR urban projects will be considered; HUD projects also pending available funds.
- (5) The last two meetings of the biennium will be reserved for cleaning up old business. No new local applications will be considered except under emergency conditions.

Upon completion of Mr. Francis' report, Mr. Bert Cole asked if the Local Action Program had been discussed with the Technical Committee and the local representatives on that committee. Mr. Francis replied it had not, that the bulk of input into the Local Action Program had been from the SCORP itself. The Committee members felt the Local Action Program should be reviewed by the Technical Committee. At this point, Mr. Bell stated he would like to know in simple language what the SCORP indicates the needs are for recreational facilities for the people of the State of Washington. Mr. Bishop clarified Mr. Bell's request stating that the Action Program as presented is really a distribution of dollars and it does not help the Committee to relate it to what the objectives and goals are of the IAC and for what purpose dollars are being spent. He felt the Action Program should spell out to a greater degree how the IAC achieves the goals as written into the SCORP. MR. ODEGAARD MOVED THAT COMMITTEE ACTION ON THE LOCAL ACTION PROGRAM BE REVIEWED BY THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE. There was no second to this motion and the Chairman therefore instructed the staff to follow the comments and suggestions made at the meeting, to involve the Technical Committee in reviewing the Local Action Program and present it to the Committee in August.

Mr. Rottler suggested that \$1,000,000 be set up for the 7th and 8th meetings for clearing up projects or for any unusual acquisition which might become available at that time. Staff was instructed by the chairman to include consideration of this request in its deliberations.

B. New Project Considerations: Mr. Lemcke was asked to report on staff memorandum of May 23, 1971 concerning New Project Considerations. Thirty-six projects were being presented to the Committee plus an additional project to be submitted to the BOR for Contingency Funding. Twenty-seven of the 36 projects were recommended for funding by IAC staff. Special stipulation in the motion to fund the projects was to include approval subject to the availability of funds; that on any development projects funded in excess of 40% of the total project cost with Initiative funds that no reimbursement shall be claimed nor paid prior to AUGUST 9, 1971.

Mr. Lemcke called attention to Table I - "Projects Recommended for Approval". Slides were shown of the 36 projects and explanations given by staff. Special action of the Committee was taken on the following projects:

Snohomish County - Wilcox Park Deleted by staff from the recommended listing (questions regarding land trade with DNR).

Lions Park - Everett - Mr. Odegaard requested that value of the buildings on projects be included on the resumes in the future.

Cheney - Northeast Park - Though Mr. Bishop realized the problems involved in this project, he asked that staff assist the community in resolving them so that eventually recreational needs in this area for the college could be realized.

Snohomish County - S.W. Major Urban - Mr. Bert Cole recommended deletion of this project because of the questions concerning land trade, etc.

Moses Lake - Cascade Park - IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. WARD THAT A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE IAC MEET WITH THE BOARD OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND REQUEST AN ESSENTIAL CHANGE IN ITS POLICY TO ALLOW THE PURCHASE OF THE LAND WITH THE STIPULATION THAT IT BE KEPT IN OUTDOOR RECREATIONAL USE. IN THE EVENT THE BOARD OF NATURAL RESOURCES REJECTS SUCH CHANGE, THE IAC HAS NONETHELESS APPROVED THE FUNDING OF THIS PROJECT AS PROPOSED AND RECOMMENDED BY STAFF. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Anacortes - 32nd Street Park - Mrs. Lemere suggested the IAC staff reinstitute the use of overlays to indicate relationship of new projects to other recreational facilities in the immediate area. The Chairman asked the Administrator to look into this matter for future meetings.

Everett--Howarth Waterfront - Mrs. Lemere questioned the variance in development costs on projects. Mr. Lofgren felt there should be certain limitations on development funding.

Wenatchee River IV - Mr. Odegaard asked Mr. Floyd Jones, Part Superintendent, Chelan County, whether Chelan County was considering trail system or parks areas in the surrounding hills. Mr. Jones replied such development was in the future.

Douglas County - East Wenatchee Park II - Mr. Odegaard noted that the Legislature had included in its appropriation bill reference to funding of swimming pools by the IAC. The wording of the appropriation, as pointed out by Mr. Francis, was "...funds herein appropriated may be used for the improvement or construction of swimming pools". The IAC therefore will consider funding of swimming pools. Mr. Francis was asked to check into BOR policy on swimming pools and evolve a policy for IAC for consideration of the Committee.

Everett Kiwanis Park - Mrs. Lemere suggested that there be critique of value concerning the review of mini-parks in the various areas -- i.e., how they are being accepted, etc.

Asotin - Chief Looking Glass - This project was discussed and later added to the list by motion as indicated on page 30 of these minutes.

Port of Friday Harbor - Robinson Crusoe Marina -
and

Port of Brownsville - Brownsville Boat Basin - These two projects were discussed by the Committee in regard to the commercial activity which could possibly become a part of the two project areas. The projects were later deleted by motion as indicated below.

Following review of the projects, Mr. Bell asked whether the members had any projects they wished to delete or add. MR. BISHOP MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN THAT THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY, SOUTHWEST MAJOR URBAN PROJECT BE DELETED FROM THE LISTING OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS; THAT THE STAFF OF IAC CONTACT THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, THIS AGENCY BEING INVOLVED IN THE LAND OWNERSHIP, AND THAT FURTHER DETAILS BE OBTAINED ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PROPOSED PROJECT PRIOR TO ITS BEING RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING BY THE COMMITTEE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

MR. ROTTLER THEN MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE PORT OF FRIDAY HARBOR (ROBINSON CRUSOE MARINA PROJECT) AND THE PORT OF BROWNSVILLE (BROWNSVILLE BOAT BASIN PROJECT) BE DELETED FROM THE LISTING OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS UNTIL SUCH TIME AS STAFF COULD OBTAIN FURTHER DETAILS AS TO THE COMMERCIAL INVOLVEMENT OF THE RECREATION AREAS IN THE TWO PROJECTS.

Discussion followed. Both port authorities represented by Mr. John Simmons of the Port of Brownsville and Mr. Bill Murphy of the Port of Friday Harbor, were questioned by the Committee and offered explanations on the proposed projects. Mr. Odegaard suggested the IAC staff meet with the two port officials to determine if the projects could be re-submitted to the Committee in August, 1971, with questions of the Committee having been adequately answered. The motion was not so amended. Question was then called for on the motion, MR. ODEGAARD VOTED "NO", AND THE MAJORITY OF THE COMMITTEE HAVING VOTED "YES", THE MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Crouse referred to the Port of Columbia, Turner Bay Marina, and asked that staff obtain from the Port a statement to the effect that this project would be maintained for recreation only and that there would not be any commercial ventures involved.

Committee members then discussed proposed recreational port facilities and how they related to use of moorages by transient, seasonal and commercial boaters. The Committee felt Initiative 215 funds should not be placed in areas where commercial boaters would use the facilities. Mrs. Lemere asked that staff be directed to review port facilities and the requests for recreational projects coming from them with a view toward assisting them in planning necessary and meaningful projects which could be funded by the IAC. She suggested considering multi-use facilities. Mr. Bell suggested the ports develop the facilities themselves then return to the Committee for funding of that portion which would be for outdoor recreational use by the public. Percentages of use of the recreational areas proposed was then discussed.

MR. ROTTLER MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE BELLEVUE, EAST CENTRAL LAKE WASHINGTON PROJECT, BE CHANGED IN FUNDING TO PROVIDE \$39,062.50 FROM REFERENDUM 18 FUNDS AND \$39,062.50 FROM INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

MRS. LEMERE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. CROUSE, THAT THE CITY OF KENT, RUSSELL ROAD, PROJECT BE FUNDED \$62,000 FROM BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FUNDS RATHER THAN FROM THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FUNDS. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Bell asked for additions to the listing.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE CITY OF ASOTIN, CHIEF LOOKING GLASS PARK PROJECT, BE INCLUDED IN THE LISTING OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

The Chairman then asked for a motion on approval for the twenty-four (24) projects which had been recommended by the Committee. The following STANDARD MOTION was then adopted by the Committee in relation to approval of the local projects noted on page 31 of these minutes:

WHEREAS THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FINDS THE PROJECTS LISTED ON PAGE 31 OF THESE MINUTES TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN, ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON APRIL 8, 1969, AND

WHEREAS THE COMMITTEE FINDS THE LISTED AGENCIES HAVE COMPLIED WITH THE REQUIREMENT OF SUBMITTING TO THE COMMITTEE A SIX-YEAR PLAN FOR ACQUIRING AND DEVELOPING OUTDOOR RECREATION FACILITIES WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY, INCLUDING NECESSARY SIX-YEAR CAPITAL BUDGET REQUIREMENTS, AND HAVE SATISFIED THE CRITERIA PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE, AND

WHEREAS SUFFICIENT FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION BY THE COMMITTEE TO MEET PROGRAM COST IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARINE RECREATION LAND ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED, (CHAPTER 5, LAWS OF 1965, CHAPTER 43.99 RCW, AS AMENDED), THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND, AND THE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE (REFERENDUM 18, CHAPTER 126, LAWS OF 1967, EXTRAORDINARY SESSION) SUBJECT TO SECURING AN ALLOTMENT WHERE NECESSARY FOR THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES;

(SEE LISTING ON PAGE 31)

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE COMMITTEE HEREBY APPROVES THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS IN THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN AMOUNTS NOT TO EXCEED THOSE LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT AS SHOWN ON PAGE 31, PROVIDED THAT THE AGENCIES INVOLVED SHALL EXECUTE ALL ASSURANCES AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS REQUIRED BY THE COMMITTEE AND SHALL

APPROVED PROJECTS

AGENCY	PROJECT	TOTAL COST	LOCAL SHARE	REF. 18	INIT. 215	BOR	HUD
Marysville	Cedar crest Golf Course	\$ 712,600	\$ 178,150	\$ 178,150		\$ 356,300	\$ 69,300
Auburn	Cascade Park	138,600	34,650	34,650			24,950
Everett	Lions Park	49,900	12,475	12,475			
Skamania Co.	Big Cedars	16,000	4,000	4,000		8,000	
Ephrata	Oasis Park	16,500	4,125	4,125		8,250	
Bremerton	Kitsap Lake	139,700	34,925	34,925			69,850
Bellevue	E. Central Lake Washington	312,600	78,150	39,075	39,075	156,300	
Kirkland	Arco Marsh	176,562	44,140.50	44,140.50		88,281	
Moses Lake	Cascade Park	54,250	13,562.50	8,137.50	5,425	141,400	
Anacortes	32nd Street Park	282,800	70,700	70,700			146,300
Seattle	North Greenwood	292,600	73,150	73,150			
Everett	Howarth-Waterfront	373,400	93,350	93,350		186,700	
Everett	W. E. Hall	332,400	83,100	83,100			166,200
Chelan County	Wenatchee River IV	120,000	30,000	30,000			
Kent	Russell Road	124,000	31,000	31,000			
Tenino	Tenino Park	60,000	15,000	15,000		62,000	
Douglas County	E. Wenatchee II	168,670	42,167.50	42,167.50		30,000	
Lynnwood	Lynnwood Park	152,000	38,000	38,000		84,335	
North Bend	E. J. Roberts	98,000	24,500	24,500		49,000	
Asotin	Chief Looking Glass	48,000	12,000	36,000			
Port of Columbia	Turner Bay Marina	135,200	33,800	47,320	54,080		
Ione	Ione Park	60,000	15,000		15,000	30,000	
Bridgeport	Waterfront Park	40,000	10,000	10,000	20,000		
Port of Indianola	Pier Reconstruction	26,500	6,625	19,875			
TOTAL		3,930,282	982,570.50	1,033,840.50	133,580	1,227,691	552,600

PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME; AND FURTHER PROVIDED THAT THE PORT OF COLUMBIA WILL SUBMIT A STATEMENT TO THE IAC TO THE EFFECT THAT THE TURNER BAY MARINA PROJECT WILL BE MAINTAINED FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND THAT THERE WILL NOT BE ANY COMMERCIAL VENTURES INVOLVED; AND

FURTHER WITH THE STIPULATION THAT APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE OF THESE PROJECTS IS SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AND ON ANY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FUNDED IN EXCESS OF 40 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL PROJECT COST WITH INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS, NO REIMBURSEMENT SHALL BE CLAIMED NOR PAID PRIOR TO AUGUST 9, 1971.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Bell called upon Mrs. Blaisdell, City of Bellevue, for presentation of the Mercer Slough project being proposed for BOR Contingency Funding. Slides were shown and Mrs. Blaisdell gave a detailed explanation of the project and its potentials to the people of Bellevue and surrounding area. MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE CITY OF BELLEVUE'S MERCER SLOUGH PROJECT BE APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., FOR CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE CONTINGENCY FUNDING.

The Chairman then recognized Mr. Jim Montgomery, City of Lynnwood. Mr. Montgomery requested a change in funding from HUD to the BOR in the Lynnwood Park project as passed in the Standard Motion on approved projects. (\$76,000 HUD funds). Mr. Bell asked the staff's recommendation. Mr. Lemcke felt staff should keep within its recommendation of \$76,000 from HUD funds. The Committee therefore did not act upon Mr. Montgomery's request.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

STANLEY E. FRANCIS
Administrator

RATIFIED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

ON

8/23/71


LEWIS A. BELL, CHAIRMAN, IAC

PERFORM AND COMPLY WITH ALL PROVISIONS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SAME; AND FURTHER PROVIDED THAT THE PORT OF COLUMBIA WILL SUBMIT A STATEMENT TO THE IAC TO THE EFFECT THAT THE TURNER BAY MARINA PROJECT WILL BE MAINTAINED FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY AND THAT THERE WILL NOT BE ANY COMMERCIAL VENTURES INVOLVED; AND

FURTHER WITH THE STIPULATION THAT APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE OF THESE PROJECTS IS SUBJECT TO AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AND ON ANY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FUNDED IN EXCESS OF 40 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL PROJECT COST WITH INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS, NO REIMBURSEMENT SHALL BE CLAIMED NOR PAID PRIOR TO AUGUST 9, 1971.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Bell called upon Mrs. Blaisdell, City of Bellevue, for presentation of the Mercer Slough project being proposed for BOR Contingency Funding. Slides were shown and Mrs. Blaisdell gave a detailed explanation of the project and its potentials to the people of Bellevue and surrounding area. MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE CITY OF BELLEVUE'S MERCER SLOUGH PROJECT BE APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., FOR CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE CONTINGENCY FUNDING, IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT \$1,300,000 IS IN THE FORM OF A DONATION OF LAND TO THE CITY OF BELLEVUE, WITH \$2,000,000 TO BE REQUESTED OF THE BOR CONTINGENCY FUND.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mercer Slough

<u>Total Project</u>	<u>BOR 50%</u>	<u>Local 50%</u>
\$4,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000 (of which \$1,300,000 is donated land)

Keep in
MINUTE
RECORDS

The Chairman then recognized Mr. Jim Montgomery, City of Lynnwood. Mr. Montgomery requested a change in funding from HUD to the BOR in the Lynnwood Park project as passed in the Standard Motion on approved projects. (\$76,000 HUD funds). Mr. Bell asked the staff's recommendation. Mr. Lemcke felt staff should keep within its recommendation of \$76,000 from HUD funds. The Committee therefore did not act upon Mr. Montgomery's request.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

STANLEY E. FRANCIS
Administrator

RATIFIED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

ON _____

LEWIS A. BELL, CHAIRMAN, IAC



4800 Capitol Blvd.
Olympia, Washington 98501
Mail Address: P.O. Box 1489
Phone: (206) 753-7140

July 13, 1971

MEMORANDUM

Daniel J. Evans, Governor
Lewis A. Bell, Chairman

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES
Department of Commerce and
Economic Development
Daniel B. Ward, Director

Department of Fisheries
Thor C. Tollefson, Director

Department of Game
Carl N. Crouse, Director

Department of Highways
George H. Andrews, Director

Department of Natural
Resources
Paul L. Cole, Commissioner
of Public Lands

State Parks and Recreation
Commission
Charles H. Odegaard, Director

CITIZEN MEMBERS
Lewis A. Bell
Dorothy A. Bishop
Mrs. Frederick Lemere
Oscar Lofgren
Jack Rottler

ADMINISTRATOR
Stanley E. Francis

TO: Interagency Committee Members
Technical Committee Members

FROM: Stanley E. Francis, Administrator

SUBJ: Official Minutes - IAC Meeting of May 23-24, 1971

Enclosed is revised page (32) of the IAC Meeting Minutes of May 23-24, 1971 (East Wenatchee). Please discard original page (32) sent you for the minute record.

Information concerning the Mercer Slough project has been corrected by the deletions in the motion as proposed by Mr. Tveten in his memorandum to the IAC of July 7, 1971 (copy enclosed). Staff had included figures contained in the memorandum from the City of Bellevue in the motion. These figures have since been corrected by Mrs. Blaisdell.

The motion now stands as follows:

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. LOFGREN, THAT THE CITY OF BELLEVUE'S MERCER SLOUGH PROJECT BE APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., FOR CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE CONTINGENCY FUNDING.

Normally changes in the minutes are brought before the Committee for approval -- however, in this instance since there was a grave misinterpretation of the project scope, it was felt a revised page to the Official Minutes should be mailed to you.

SEF

SEF:mmf

Enclosures

- Revised page (32), IAC minutes
May 23-24, 1971
- J. Tveten - memo of 7-7-71

D

DANIEL J. EVANS
GOVERNOR

COMMISSIONERS:
MRS. ELEANOR BERGER
JEFF D. DOMASKIN
THOMAS C. GARRETT
RALPH E. MACKAY
JAMES G. McCURDY
JAMES W. WHITTAKER
WILFRED WOODS

CHARLES H. ODEGAARD,
DIRECTOR



WASHINGTON STATE
PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION

7150 CLEANWATER LANE

PHONE 753-5755

THURSTON AIRINDUSTRIAL CENTER P. O. BOX 1128 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98504

July 7, 1971

TO: Stanley Francis, Administrator
Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation

FROM: Jan Tveten, Capital Budget Coordinator *Jan*

RE: Minutes of the May IAC Meeting

Please add the following correction to the minutes of the regular meeting of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation, held May 24, 1971, in East Wenatchee.

Project: Mercer Slough Acquisition

Page 32, 4th paragraph, delete the following, *It being understood that \$1,300,000 is in the form of a donation of land to the City of Bellevue, with 2,000,000 to be requested of the BOR contingency fund.*

The Bellefield Company, under the direction of Mr. Norman Volotin has offered to donate up to 50 acres if that is the required local matching share. The donation referred to in the minutes represents only a donation of approximately 20 acres at the value established by the latest appraisal of the property owned by the Bellefield Company.

Page 32, 6th paragraph, delete the following,

<u>BOR 50%</u>	<u>Local 50%</u>
\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000 (of which 1,300,000 is donated land)

It was my understanding from the comments at the meeting that a project funded by the BOR contingency fund was not limited to 50% matching and that the exact formula would be negotiated later. The intent of the motion was only to approve the filing of the application for BOR contingency funds.

JT:cs

cc: Mrs. Joan Blaisdell, Project Coordinator
City of Bellevue Parks and Recreation