

Meeting was to be April 28-29; then May 26-27; but due to Legislature was changed to June 16-17, 1975.

I. Opening of meeting, determination of quorum, introductions

- a. Lack of quorum - until 10:32 (arrival of Don Moos, Director of Fisheries)

II. Fiscal Status Reports

- A. a. Disbursement Record - Local Agency Projects 12-1-74 thru 4-30-75  
 b. Summary Form - Disbursement Record  
 c. Init. 215, Distribution Control Sheet  
 d. Local Project billings report  
 e. LWCF Cumulative Report of Apportionments and Distribution  
 f. Fund Summary, May 31, 1975

Approval of Minutes - Dec. 9-10, 1974

Approval of Minutes - Feb. 26, 1975

- g. Non-budgeted ORA Expenditure DNR \$20,000 APPROVED BY IAC  
 h. Land and Water Conservation Funds report - reapportionment \$67,000 for State of Wash.

B. Project Status Report

- a. Administrative Actions  
 1. Poulsbo, Liberty Bay Park 73-050D \$46,965 Cost Inc. APPROVED  
 2. Vancouver Lake, Clark Co. 73-075D Cost increase DENIED  
 3. Seattle, Atlantic City Boat Ramp 72-012D Cost Increase DENIED  
 4. Pullman, Palouse River Pk. 74-011D \$9,340 Cost increase APPROVED  
 5. Naches P&R Dist., Applewood Pk. 74-034A \$2,208 cost increase APPROVED  
 6. Chelan, Lakeshore Pk, Phse II 72-036D, Reduction in cost and scope APPROVED.

II C. Planning Status Reports

- a. Washington State Recreation Trails - ATV Corridors. NOT APPROVED -- held until August or December IAC meeting.  
 b. Pacific Crest Trail report  
 c. Demand Study report (Questionnaire and Survey form distributed)  
 d. Local Agency Plans report  
 e. Regional Origin-Destination Travel and Expenditure Survey  
 f. Governor's Wilderness Task Force report

Permit Presentation - Bert Bowen -- Lynn Martin, Parks and Rec.

Ecology

Lloyd Bell, DNR

James Brigham, Game

Jim Webster, King County Dept. of Parks

MOTION re having legislative bodies look into and study environmental factors placed upon state agencies and private agencies -- MOTION FAILED.

Procedural Guidelines - Questions of Odegaard in re.

IIIA. Technical Advisory Committee - Wilson, Webster, McCartan, Hutsinpillar appointed.  
 APPROVED.

III B. Dept. Game, Nisqually Delta-Luhr 70-606A, Conversion of Use APPROVED.

III C. Project Changes:

1. Local Projects

- a. City of Everett, Forest Park Pool, IAC 74-046D, Cost Inc DENIED.
- b. City of Tumwater, Deschutes River Pk 74-028A, Reduction in Scope APPROVED. \$ 6,600 WITHDRAWN
- c. City of Seattle, Queen Anne Hill Viewpoint, 74-028D, Cost Inc. APPROVED. \$7,471.65
- d. King County reinstate expired Contracts - 7 projects - to 12-31-75 City of Spokane (Central Riverfront 73-019D, and 72-040A) reinstate expired contracts to 12-31-75 APPROVED
- e. Chehalis, Stan Hedwall Pk 72-021D, Reduction in Scope APPROVED.
- f. Mercer Slough, City Bellevue/State Parks, 73-026A APPROVED \$67,400 additional cost.

III 2. State Projects

- a. Parks and Rec. Fort Canby 71-504 \$620,000 from 75-77 Capital Budg. APP.
- b. Game, Skagit R. (Kathman) Boat Launch 73-625D withdrawal APPROVED.
- c. Game, Bogachiel Riv (Wilson Bridge) 73-619D, Cost increase APPROVED \$8,024
- d. DNR, Howell Lake 73-721D, Cost Inc. \$10,000 APPROVED
- e. DNR, R. F. Kennedy Boat Dock 73-723D, \$4,320 APPROVED. cost inc.
- f. DNR, Indian Caves Camp and Picnic Area - withdrawal APPROVED. 73-700D
- g. DNR, Snohomish Pilchuck Rec. Area - 73-084D, - DELAYED TO AUGUST.
- h. Town of Tenino, 70-026A and 71-935D - APPROVED relocation RR depot.

III D. IAC Operating Budget, 75-77 report

E. IAC Capital Budget 75-77 report

- a. 1976 Supplemental Budget
- b. Blakely Island

F. Legislation report

G. Arts Commission 1/2 of 1% - report - staff to check into same.

H. Procedural Guidelines

- a. 03.03.020 Limitation on Applications - DELAYED TO AUGUST or until Guidelines revised.
- b. 05.03.000 Ineligible Dev. Projects - (1) - APPROVED.
- c. 05.15-000 Architectural Barriers Act - APPROVED to add signing parag.
- d. Implementation - BOR Letter of Agreement - APPROVED TO SIGN BY ADMIN. making agreement update between IAC/BOR

IV NEW BUSINESS

Funding Schedule Considerations - Biennium - Stan Francis report

Discussion in re funding - MOTION OF COMMITTEE TO FUND \$4. Million at June meeting; and staff to have funding formula for rest of biennium at August 1975 meeting.

A. Local Agency Projects presentation.

- a. Referral of Tables I thru V(a) - R. Syverson
- b. Comments on various projects:
  1. Lewis County, Shaefer Pk.

- Comments  
made on these  
projects only.
- ( 2. Warden, Volunteer Park
  - ( 3. Whatcom Co., Tennant Lake
  - ( 4. Kitsap Co., Salsbury Point Co. Park
  - ( 5. Langley, Phil Simon Pk.
  - ( 6. Winslow, Eagle Harbor Pk.
  - ( 7. Clark Co., Wintler Pk.
  - ( 8. White Salmon, White Salmon Comm. Pk.
  - ( 9. Bainbridge Is., Park Dist., Battle Point Pk.
  - ( 10. Lynnwood, Lynnwood Swim Pool
  - ( 11. Mesa, Poe Park
  - ( 12. Skokomish Indian Tribe, Skokomish Rec. Area
  - ( 13. Quincy, Quincy E. Park II
  - ( 14. Walla Walla, Vets. Memorial Pk.
  - ( 15. Lacey, Hicks Lake Pk.
  - ( 16. Everett, Boat Launch Facility
  - ( 17. Selah, Wenas Athletic Pk.

Local Agency representatives comments:

- 1. Robt. Broyles, Proj. Coord. Consultant Asotin Co. - Rec. Center
- 2. Harlow Stordahl, Mgr., Port of Kalama - Transient Boat Facility
- 3. Ray Jenson, Director P&R, Selah - Wenas Pk.
- 4. Gordon Schultz, Chrmn, P & R. Comm., Lacey - Hicks Lake
- 5. Robt. Giesen, Mgr., Port of Skagit County - LaConner Marina
- 6. Madge Long, Naches P&R Dist. Applewood Pk.
- 7. Sam Maxson, Director Parks and Rec., Walla Walla - Veterans Park
- 8. John Belford, Mgr., Port of Everett - Marine
- 9. Robt. Woerner, Consultant, Landscape Arch, City of Tekoa - Golf Course
- 10. William Mahan, Kitsap Co. Comm - Village Green
- 11. Gary Peterson, Skokomish Indian Tribe - Skokomish Rec. Area
- 12. Roger Loscehn, Lake Forest Pk, City Councilman - LFP Tennis Courts
- 13. Sid Hansen, Town Treasurer, Town of Clyde Hill - Clyde Hill Pk.

MOTION TO APPROVE LOCAL PROJECTS -- (various amendments; motions; etc.)35 projects funded - listing on pages 43-44 of these minutes.)

IV. B. State Agency Projects

APPROVED - Pages 42-45-46-47 APPROVED IN TOTO

August Session - explanation

V. Administrator's Report - and next meeting at Westport, August 25-26, 1975

Adjourned 4:30 p.m.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION  
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

SPECIAL MEETING

June 16-17, 1975  
Monday-Tuesday

10:00 a.m. Monday  
9:00 a.m. Tuesday

Elks Club Meeting Room  
Everett, Washington

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. Adele Anderson; Warren A. Bishop; Micaela Brostrom; Madeline Lemere; John A. Biggs, Director, Dept. of Ecology; Carl Crouse, Director, Department of Game; Donald W. Moos, Director, Department of Fisheries; Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission; Michael Ross.

IAC MEMBERS ABSENT: George Andrews, Director, Department of Highways; John S. Larsen, Director, Commerce and Economic Development Department; Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands, Department of Natural Resources.

STAFF OF TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND MEMBER AGENCIES PRESENT:

Assistant Attorney General  
Charles Murphy

Commerce and Economic Development  
Merlin Smith

Ecology, Department of  
Beecher Snipes Bert Bowen

Fisheries, Department of  
Richard Costello

Game, Department of  
James Brigham

Highways, Department of  
Willa Mylroie

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation  
Larry Burk, RRS  
Kenn Cole, Agency Accounts Officer  
Stanley E. Francis, Administrator  
Marjorie M. Frazier, Admin. Secretary  
J. David Grant, RRS  
Robert S. Lemcke, Coordinator  
Greg Lovelady, RRS  
Glenn Moore, RRS  
Gerald Pelton, Chief, Planning and Coordination  
Dave Redekop, Planner  
Roger Syverson, Chief, Proj. Administration Division  
Ron Taylor, RRS  
Jerry Monasmith, Intern - Monday  
Geoffrey Dahlberg, CETA - Tuesday  
Deborah Hill, CETA - Tuesday  
Brian D. Ramey, CETA - Monday

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1975 Pgs. 1-25

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1975 Pgs. 25-48

Natural Resources, Department of  
Al O'Donnell  
Lloyd Bell

Park and Recreation Commission  
Lynn Martin  
Tom France

Program Planning and Fiscal Management  
None

LOCAL AGENCY TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robert Wilder, City of Seattle, alternate for Dave Towne, Supt., Parks and Recreation  
Kenneth Hertz, Director, Parks and Recreation, Whatcom County  
William Hutsinpiller, Director, Parks and Recreation, Yakima  
Art McCartan, Chairman, Whitman County Parks Dept., Pullman  
James E. Webster, King County Park and Recreation, Seattle  
E. E. Allen, BOR, alternate for Maurice Lundy, Reg. Director, BOR, Seattle

I. Meeting called to order determination of quorum, introductions: Chairman Bishop called the meeting to order at 10:16 a.m. He noted the June 16-17 Special meeting had been called in place of the regular April 28-29 IAC meeting which had been changed to May 26-27 due to continued session of the State Legislature and the need for Committee members and staff to remain in Olympia to consider budgetary and other legislative items. Mr. Bill Jones, Everett Park and Recreation Department representative, was introduced. Due to lack of a quorum those items requiring no action of the Committee were initially discussed.

II A. Fiscal Status Reports: Mr. Kenn Cole, Agency Accounts Officer, referred to fiscal reports as follows:

Disbursement Record - Local Agency Projects, Dec. 1, 1974 thru April 30, 1975: As of April 30, 1975, 365 local agency projects had been approved by the Committee; 263 closed; and 102 currently in progress. Thirty-two projects were closed within the last five months.

Disbursement Record-Summary Form: 88 vouchers were processed from December 19, 1974 through April 30, 1975, and 32 projects were closed; \$3,104,468.12 was expended from the Outdoor Recreation Account. Since 1973 \$9,922,847.69 was expended from the Account.

Initiative 215, Distribution Control Sheet: The six-month period since the last regular meeting of the IAC (December, 1974) indicated \$551,940.43 had been transferred from the Motor Vehicles to the IAC; of this \$186,921.65 was expended for operations, leaving \$365,018.78 available for distribution to local agencies, and the departments of Game, DNR, and Parks. At present, balance in the fund is \$601,613. In response to questions of Mr. Bishop, Mr. Cole explained the percentage of gross tax was raised from .86 to 1.03 through the 1972 Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Study, which was effective July 1, 1973. Mr. Francis stated the study would be undertaken every four years, the next study to be made during the calendar year 1976. Legislation to amend the law which would have implemented the study July 1 of the calendar year in which it was conducted failed to pass the Legislature.

Local Project billings: Mr. Bishop asked the status of reimbursement payments to local agencies. Mr. Cole said he had been current but now had about fifteen vouchers pending. He stated, however, that concerted effort in the next six weeks to reimburse local agencies in the amount of at least \$1,000,000 would be made, inasmuch as the reappropriation for grant-in-aid had been underestimated by approximately this amount.

LWCF Cumulative Report of Apportionments and Distribution: Mr. Cole briefly explained the import of the Land and Water Conservation Fund report delineating the apportionments and distribution of the funds since 1965 to local agencies, Game, DNR and Parks. The net cumulatively available for projects as of May 31, 1975 was \$19,668,647.51. The IAC records and those of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation are in balance as of that date.

Fund Summary, May 31, 1975: Funding in the amount of \$87,103,859.96 from all sources (LWCF, Ref. 11, Ref. 18, Ref. 28, and Init. 215) was indicated on the Fund Summary for May 31, 1975, with \$80,505,457.57 presently approved for IAC projects by the Committee; leaving a balance of \$6,598,402.39 available for projects at the end of May, with approximately \$6 million of this appropriated for use by State agencies.

With the arrival of Don Moos, Director, Dept. of Fisheries, at 10:32 a.m., the Chairman declared a quorum, and introduced Mr. Moos. Other introductions were:

- Gary Tranter, Senate Staff member
- Joe Miller, City Mgr., City of Bellevue
- Nancy Rising, City of Bellevue - Mayor pro-tem

Mr. Stan Francis, Administrator, IAC, introduced new staff members:

- David Grant, Recreation Resource Officer, Projects Admin. Division
- Ronald Taylor, Recreation Resource Officer, Projects Admin. Division
- Jerry Monasmith, Intern - working with Thermal Power Plant Site Evaluation Council - assisting the Administrator of the IAC

Approval of Minutes, December 9-10, 1974: The following corrections were referred to the Committee for consideration:

(1) Micki Brostrom:

(a) Page 13, last paragraph, line 3: Following the words "...a 26% cost increase" INSERT the following "...rather than the 16% increase requested..."

(b) DELETE THE REMAINDER OF THE PARAGRAPH (which continues on page 14) and INSERT the following wording with changes as underlined or as deleted:

"...and (2) she felt at some time it was going to be necessary to carefully consider cost increases on local and state agency projects because the granting of same allotted monies which should more appropriately be placed in use for new recreational projects of the IAC. IAC has an obligation to all local agencies to make available funds go as far as possible and the automatic granting of increases makes approval of any given project virtually a blank check, penalizing all other local agencies applying for funds."

(c) Page 19, first paragraph, top of the page beginning with "....on the cost increase" INSERT the following: "...and questioned the reduction in number of camping sites to reduce cost with no reduction in size or scope of the interpretive center which is the major cost."

(d) To clarify that it was Mr. Odegaard who made the comments which follow this insert, the following changes are necessary:

"However, she Mr. Odegaard pointed out that each state agency has certain statutory responsibility. State Parks' responsibility does not include merely camping facilities since there must also be day-use facilities for the public. She He felt that (etc. etc. thru item 4). She He suggested the Committee allot the \$620,000... (etc. etc. to end of paragraph)."

(2) Bert Cole (by Al O'Donnell):

(a) On page 14 2. State Projects: a. DNR - Two Trails; Two Trailheads, #71-704D - Cost Increase; line 11 -- after word "remaining" change "3.6" to "3.4".

(b) On page 34, IV. c. 2. Department of Natural Resources: a. Tree Phones Line 1, change "60" to "59.2".

(c) On page 35, g. McLane Creek - line 2, change "41" to "41.86".  
h. Bald Point Vista - line 2, spell Tahuya instead of Thuya

(3) Adele Anderson:

(a) Page 10 - third paragraph of the motion regarding Fort Canby, change to read "FIVE MEMBERS VOTED FOR THE MOTION; MR. ANDREWS, MRS. BROSTROM AND MR. BIGGS VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE." (Deleting Mrs. Anderson's name since she had voted for the motion.)

(b) Page 29 - 7th paragraph, language change of last sentence: "~~During the ensuing discussion, etc. etc.~~ "... It was brought out that the cities of Rosalia, Issaquah, Buckley, Langley, and others were before the Committee for the first time and should be considered for funding.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE DECEMBER 9-10, 1974 MEETING BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Approval of Minutes, February 26, 1975: The following corrections to the February 26, 1975 minutes were referred to the Committee for consideration:

(1) Charles Odegaard:

(a) Page 2, paragraph 11, item (4) - "Extended Future Development program": ADD the following item -- "Development of hiking and fire control trails between Armitage Bay, Spencer Lake and Thatcher Bay."

(2) Micaela Brostrom:

(a) Page 6, paragraph 3, change sentence to read: "A total of \$850,000 is the amount State Parks would need to 'return' to the other-state agencies-in-the-1977-79-biennium balance of unallocated funds available for distribution to the participating State agencies in their

1977-79 biennium budgets."

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MRS. ANDERSON, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 26, 1975 MEETING BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Additions-Deletions to the Agenda: Mr. Francis made the following deletions to the June 16-17, 1975 agenda:

- Deleted Local Agency Project - Kitsap County, Fairgrounds Park Development.  
(Withdrawn at request of Kitsap County)
- Deleted State Agency Project - Dept. of Game, Big Buck Ranch.

There were no additions to the agenda for discussion purposes at the Special Meeting.

Mr. Ralph Mackey, Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission member, was introduced by the Chairman, as well as John Biggs, Director, Department of Ecology (arrived 10:35 a.m.).

II A (continued) - Non-budgeted ORA Expenditure Dept. of Natural Resources (\$20,000):

Mr. Kenn Cole referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, and reviewed the need for a Committee motion to enable IAC staff to commit an expenditure of ORA monies into its fiscal records (since there was no "Project" processed thru the Committee to establish such record), and to reflect a reduction in funds available for distribution by the Committee from Ref. 28 funds, due to a line-itemmed appropriation to DNR of \$20,000 from the ORA to provide certain recreational facilities. Following his explanation, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON WITHIN CHAPTER 114, LAWS OF 1ST EXTRAORDINARY SESSION 1973, AUTHORIZED THE EXPENDITURE OF \$20,000 FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT ADMINISTERED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION TO BE USED TO "DEVELOP PUBLIC CAMP FACILITIES", AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES REQUESTED AN ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT FOR THAT PURPOSE, AND

WHEREAS, SUCH ALLOTMENT WAS APPROVED BY THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM PLANNING AND FISCAL MANAGEMENT, AND

WHEREAS, FUNDS HAVE SUBSEQUENTLY BEEN SPENT FOR THAT PURPOSE FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION RECOGNIZES THIS COMMITMENT FOR EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AND INSTRUCTS ITS STAFF TO RECORD SAID EXPENDITURE IN THE FISCAL RECORDS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AS A MISCELLANEOUS CHARGE TO THE ACCOUNT MADE OUTSIDE THE REGULAR IAC FISCAL PROCEDURES, AND FOOTNOTED ACCORDINGLY.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Chairman Bishop introduced to the Committee and the audience Mr. Michael Ross, new member of the IAC appointed by the Governor. (Arrived 10:46 a.m.)

Land and Water Conservation Funds: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff "Land and Water Conservation Funds", dated May 26, 1975, with attached copy of a letter from BOR Director James Watt concerning the reapportionment to the states of deobligated funds on the basis of need. Deobligated amounts eligible for reappointment will occur when a project is cancelled before work is begun or when projects are completed for less than the amount originally obligated. Currently, the State of Washington has available approximately \$67,000 of deobligated funds, and these monies can be used to assist in funding projects at the June meeting. Mr. Francis stated to receive the FY 75 deobligated funds, a state must have evidence showing that currently available funds have been committed; and the state may request through the Regional Director of BOR any portion or all of the funds by justifying the need in writing.

II B. Project Status Report: Roger Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, "Project Status Report" which indicated 31 local agency projects and 10 state agency projects had been closed out since December 1, 1974.

Administrative Actions: The following administrative actions were reported to the Committee:

- a. Poulsbo, Liberty Bay Park, 73-050D \$ 46,965 cost increase approved.  
\$516,615: \$ 117,412.50 28 \$234,825 BOR \$ 35,223.75 215 \$ 129,153.75 Local
- b. Clark Co., Vancouver Lake Dev. 73-075D Cost increase denied.
- c. Seattle, Atlantic City Boat Ramp 72-012D Cost increase denied.
- d. Pullman, Palouse River Pk. 74-011D \$9,340 cost increase approved.  
\$183,776: \$ 45,944.00 28 91,888 BOR \$ 45,944 local
- e. Naches P&R Dist., Applewood Pk. 74-034A \$2,208 cost increase approved.  
\$ 44,458: \$ 11,114.50 28 22,229 BOR \$ 11,114.50 local
- f. City of Chelan, Lakeshore Pk, Phse II 72-036D Reduction in cost and scope approved.  
(Deleted construction of floating breakwater)  
\$263,400.06 \$ 197,550.05 18 \$ 65,850.01 local

Mr. Ross asked why the City of Seattle's request for cost increase of \$13,498 was denied by staff of the IAC. Roger Syverson, Project Administration officer, pointed out: (1) Though funded by the IAC in May 1972, construction on the project had been considerably delayed through action by Seattle and staff felt this had caused increased cost on the project. (2) Redesign of the project also took place after IAC approval and had taken more time to implement.

Mrs. Lemere asked whether the Design Commission of the City of Seattle had been consulted on this particular project and other Seattle projects. Mr. Syverson stated in the past the Seattle projects were reviewed by the IAC prior to going before the Design Committee, but lately this policy had been changed and all Seattle projects are now reviewed by the Design Commission prior to coming to the IAC for funding consideration. Mr. Ross stated he was satisfied with the answers given by staff. Mr. Robert Wilder, City of Seattle, commented the cost increase on the project actually was an internal problem and should be resolved at that level.

II C. Planning Status Reports: Mr. Gerald Pelton, Chief, Planning and Coordination Section, referred to Planning Graph, dated May 26, 1975, and accompanying memoranda relating to ATV Corridors, Pacific Crest Trail, Demand Survey, Local Agency Plans,

and Origin-Destination Study, of same date.

1. Washington State Recreation Trails - ATV Corridors: Mr. Pelton, assisted by Trails Coordinator, Greg Lovelady, presented the proposal for adoption of ATV Corridors as outlined in the memorandum. An overlay map was displayed to the Committee indicating (1) Water corridors, (2) Foot and Horse Trail Corridors, (3) Bicycle Corridors -- all adopted by the Committee on December 10, 1973, as official corridors for the State Trails Program. Added to the map were the All-Terrain Vehicle Corridors currently being proposed for Committee adoption as additions to the Trails Program.

The State Trails Advisory Committee met on March 6, 1975, to review the final results of a study dedicated to establishing ATV corridors. The recommendations were adopted by the Trails Committee. Agencies involved in developing the study and proposed corridors were: U. S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Department of Game, Department of Natural Resources, IAC, four wheel drivers and motorcyclists.

Following the presentation, several questions were asked by the Committee: Mr. Ross was concerned with the present energy situation and whether the survey made for use of ATV trails had indicated these areas would be used and were, in fact, needed. He suggested staff develop an energy impact for ATV trails. Mr. Pelton pointed out that the corridors were only an initial phase of the planning process in order to determine relationships with other uses and areas of primary need. Energy impact would more properly be a primary consideration during the implementation phase.

Further, Mr. Pelton noted the proposal by staff was merely to designate potential trail areas for future consideration in developing a Statewide ATV network of trails. In response to a question from Mr. Bishop, Mr. Pelton stated about \$1.5 million was generated per year from gasoline taxes and ATV registration fees.

Mr. Biggs was concerned with the expansive area of the corridors as indicated on the map and asked the boundaries involved. Mr. Pelton replied there were no boundaries as such at this time, that the corridors were being designated to enable incorporation into the Washington State Recreation Trails Program, 1974. Mr. O'Donnell pointed out that while there appeared to be overlapping between the ATV trails and other types of trail corridors; that the law did require separation of mechanized trails from foot and equestrian trails. He assumed that when implemented there would be separate individual trails for the ATV use and the other types of users. There followed some discussion regarding separate hours of use for some of the established trails. Mr. Pelton stated where trails closely parallel each other there should of necessity be ancillary facilities for all trail users -- such as parking, restrooms, etc.

Mr. Crouse inquired whether a local group could design an ATV trail though not within the corridor, would it still be considered as an eligible project to be funded by the Committee? Mr. Pelton noted that ATV funds are on a block grant formula basis and not by project as are other IAC funds. He stated, however, that a local trail would not need to fall within the trail corridors to be funded, but if the community wished it designated as a part of the State Trail Program, then it would need to be within the trail corridors established as part of the State Trail Plan.

Mr. Biggs felt there was still a broad license being provided for the proposed

ATV corridors and he suggested the boundaries were much too expansive. Further, environmental aspects ought to be considered on all trails, not only the ATV trails. Mr. Pelton then explained adopting the ATV corridors would be only the first step towards establishing a future State Trails System; it would probably take some 15 to 20 years before a statewide system of trails could be fully implemented.

Mr. O'Donnell suggested a presentation be made to the Committee on the criteria and rationale used for the ATV corridors and trails so that it would be fully understood what direction is being taken in planning the corridors.

At this point, Mr. Pelton called upon Mrs. Loretta Slater, Chairman of the State Trails Committee, for remarks. She explained the attempt of the Committee to lay out the ATV trails in relation to the foot and equestrian trails, keeping the interests of all users in mind, as well as including the environmental impact of the trails on the specific areas under discussion. Mr. Bishop suggested setting aside discussion of the ATV corridors to the August meeting. Mr. Ross then asked if special interest groups, such as the Wheat Grower's Association and Cattlemen's Association had been contacted about the establishment of ATV corridors. He was assured these groups were knowledgeable about the actions of the State Trails Committee and, in fact, some of the members on the Trails Sub-Committees were also members of these groups.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, THAT THE IAC INCLUDE ON ITS AGENDA FOR THE AUGUST 1975 MEETING A PRESENTATION ON ATV CORRIDORS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED. (See last page of these minutes - Committee decided December, 1975)

Al O'Donnell suggested this discussion should include the entire State Trails Act, its import on the ATV corridors and other specifics regarding state trails.

2. Pacific Crest Trail: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum dated May 26, 1975, "Pacific Crest Trail", and reported the following actions had been taken by the Pacific Crest Trail Council - Washington Sub-Group concerning the 14 mile section of trail located south of the Gifford Pinchot National Forest in Washington State:

- a. A trail route as well as primary and secondary trailheads have been tentatively selected;
- b. An impasse was declared -- regarding the governmental entity that should assume the leadership responsibility in completing this section of the trail.
- c. Involved agencies are to present the matter to those officials deemed appropriate for final resolution of the issue.

A copy of the letter from Governor Evans to John R. McGuire, Chief, USFS, dated May 14, 1975, was distributed to each Interagency Committee member for review. This letter requested that the Forest Service assume the lead agency responsibility for this segment of the trail.

3. Demand Study: The Demand Survey Questionnaire and Telephone Inquiry Sheet were distributed to each Interagency Committee member for review. Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, "Demand Survey", reporting the following:

- a. Actual survey was initiated on May 15, 1975, with Washington State University

Special Research Center administering the survey. A total of 10,000 households will eventually be contacted by telephone, and of the present 2,000 households thus far contacted, 75% have agreed to participate in the study. The study requests each household contacted to complete the questionnaire concerning their participation in outdoor recreation activities for a selected two-week period for each member of the household. The survey will be conducted from May 15, 1975 to May 14, 1976, thus assuring that all seasons and days of the year are sampled.

- b. Mr. Pelton also advised that in return for participation in the survey the National Park Service is providing staff and computer services for the demand survey, amounting to approximately \$30,000 worth of work which would not otherwise have been possible.

Mrs. Anderson suggested that telephone interviewers identify themselves as calling concerning a state sponsored demand study program and not merely one that is being conducted through a university. Mr. Pelton stated that this was considered, but since the interviewer is asking for demographic information only, that it was thought they would give it more freely to a university than a state agency. The survey form, however, is identified as being a state survey. Mr. Pelton indicated his staff would look at the interview process again in view of her suggestions.

- c. Mr. Pelton noted the survey will only be statistically reliable at the county level, as it would be too costly a program to obtain sufficient data for reliability below that level.

4. Local Agency Plans: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, "Local Agency Plans", stating the Planning Division presently has on file 150 Local Plans; of these, 55 were prepared prior to 1970 and must be updated; 114 are from incorporated cities; 27 county plans; 7 port districts; 1 school district (Manson), and one Indian Tribe (Skokomish). Three additional Tribal plans lack only an Action Program segment (Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan) to receive planning eligibility. Interim planning was granted to Aberdeen, Pasco and one county (Thurston) for the June funding session only. Further eligibility is contingent upon the submission of their required materials still lacking from their planning documents.

Mrs. Anderson asked the definition of "interim eligibility". She was advised agencies may apply for planning eligibility and be in process of putting their plan together and are making an honest effort to complete a full plan up to the time of their application for grant-in-aid assistance. Interim eligibility is only given to an agency ahead of submission of an application. The 30-day limit for a plan to be on file with the IAC prior to application still applies as outlined in the Procedural Guidelines.

Mr. Odegaard inquired whether there weren't other state agencies involved in assuring that local agencies have similar plans, such as the Office of Community Development, and could not those plans as approved through these agencies be acceptable to the IAC, rather than having an entirely new plan processed through the IAC for eligibility to participate in the grant-in-aid program. Mr. Pelton replied IAC works closely with OCD, which agency has the responsibility for the Local Agency 701 plans. Where a local agency already has such a plan

approved, the IAC only requires completion of an Action Program and any other recreation elements not part of the 701 plan thus making the local agency eligible for the grant-in-aid application process. Both Mr. Odegaard and Mrs. Mylroie commented on the fact that local agency plans are on file in other agencies, and the Highway Department maintains an index of these plans which is distributed to other state agencies upon request. Mr. Pelton acknowledged that the IAC does make use of these completed plans wherever possible, keeping in mind the requirements of the IAC Procedural Guidelines for a specific Action Program element. He noted that many types of local plans are for a specific purpose such as sewers, streets, etc., and do not include the elements necessary for a recreation plan.

5. Regional Origin-Destination Travel and Expenditure Survey: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, and noted:

(a) On May 9, 1975, a grant to the Pacific NW Regional Commission for an inter-state origin-destination travel and expenditure survey had been presented by IAC staff on behalf of the Regional Commission Recreation Task Force. The survey was designed to further a data collection and terminology standardization program that the three state SCORP planning agencies (IAC, Dept. of Highways, for Oregon, and Dept. of Parks and Recreation for Idaho) had been engaged in for the past one and one-half years through the Recreation Data Sub-Committee of the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission.

(b) The proposal was for \$216,384 to enable the three states to:

- (1) Conduct a year long origin-destination travel and expenditure survey.
- (2) Project travel and expenditure patterns by geographical location (county).
- (3) Analyze the feasibility of maintaining current origin-destination travel and expenditure data through some process of annual update.

The IAC was unofficially informed that the project request had been denied. However, Mr. Pelton stated other potential sources would be considered and it might be possible to fund the program in another manner.

5. Governor's Wilderness Task Force: Mr. Pelton reported that the IAC Planning Division has provided staff coordination for this Task Force since its inception in 1972. All IAC member agencies have representation on the Task Force. Mr. Pelton indicated that recommendations on the proposed Alpine Lakes Wilderness in the central Cascades had been prepared and forwarded to the Governor. He noted that Congressional hearings on Alpine Lakes were scheduled for Seattle, on June 28th, and that the Governor was expected to testify.

6. BOR Planning: Mr. Francis read a letter from Maurice Lundy, Regional Director, BOR, dated June 6, 1975, commending the IAC and its Planning Division on the planning efforts under Option II being made through that Division. BOR has authorized continuation of the planning effort under Option II.

Permit Presentation: Upon reconvening from lunch, Mr. Bishop called upon Mr. Biggs to preface the discussion concerning permits -- a subject which had been requested to be on the agenda for Committee information during deliberations at the December 9-10, 1974 meeting.

Mr. Biggs stated: (1) The Committee had many times discussed the need for environmental permits and the delay in time to secure them -- those required from the Department of Ecology as well as those required from other agencies and organizations. (2) Two years ago the State Legislature established an environmental coordination statute to bring applicants together "around the table" for permit discussions. However, this process has not been used both at the level of local government nor at the state level. (3) The Department of Ecology was interested in explaining the methods involved in the coordination procedures for the one-stop permit procedure system. Mr. Biggs called upon Mr. Bert Bowen of his department.

Mr. Bowen, using the overhead projector for slide program, introduced the subject by outlining the procedures necessary under the ECPA (Environmental Coordination Procedures Act). The Act was designed to establish a process for environmental coordination; provide public forums; coordinate judicial review; provide permit information and optional procedures. Agencies using the ECPA procedure may obtain information as to rules, regulations, public hearings from DOE. Coordination is handled through information officers within a county-wide program -- each county has a subsidiary office of the Department of Ecology. These information officers assist applicants in obtaining permits and/or obtaining information about permits. They are also able to assist with master applications for projects. The master application is initiated at the county level.

Mr. Bowen then outlined the master application procedure and explained how DOE assists in coordinating the permit process required of agencies. DOE prepares public notices -- for public hearings -- to inform the public of the project; then chairs the hearings with agencies involved. There are approximately 34 permits which may be reviewed or screened to see if they are applicable to projects. An applicant before beginning a project or starting construction needs to know: (1) Agencies issuing permits - which ones are required; (2) Where are they obtained? (3) When should they be obtained? (4) In what order should they be obtained? (5) What information is required for the permits needed? (6) What are the design requirements of the project? and (7) When can construction begin?

Mr. Bowen stated the procedure through DOE assisted in three ways: (1) Produced and had available from other agencies the information required for permits; (2) Information was available on regular basis as to status of each project being assisted through DOE; and (3) at least six months prior to construction, all of the necessary permit elements and special work necessary had been coordinated.

At completion of Mr. Bowen's presentation, Mr. Francis introduced the three state agency representatives and one local agency representative to make permit presentations:

Lynn Martin, Parks and Recreation Commission

Lloyd Bell, Dept. of Natural Resources

James Brigham, Dept. of Game

James Webster, King County Dept. of Parks

Lynn Martin, Parks and Recreation Commission: Mrs. Martin exhibited on the overhead projector a flowchart indicating timing involved in the beginning of a grant-in-aid project. Chart Two outlined the necessary steps in obtaining a shoreline management permit -- a minimum of 94 days to process. She pointed out it takes much longer than 30 days to obtain the permit ... sometimes it is over a year. Chart Three listed the various permits required for State Parks projects. Mrs. Martin outlined each permit and gave a short explanation of the time involved in completing the process of obtaining each one.

Insert - approved 8-25-75:

"At conclusion of Mrs. Martin's presentation, Mr. Bowen commented that some 90% of the applications submitted utilizing the ECPA procedure were returned to the submitting agency to pursue on their own."

Lloyd Bell, Dept. of Natural Resources: Mr. Bell noted DNR has 17 permits. It must obtain in order to commence a small primitive campground project; (Some do not apply to every campground, but normally there are 17 permits involved.) DNR felt there must be controls, especially environmental permit controls, and felt the present system though workable could be improved upon. He noted the need to follow the directions within the SCORP while at the same time providing the most satisfactory environmental control on acquisition and development of projects as possible. He distributed to the Committee proposed revisions to the State and Local Procedural Guidelines which would better coordinate state and local growth factors in the various regions and would incorporate within the local agency planning a Recreation Needs Section which would be adopted as a part of the city or county plan. He stressed the need for local agencies to support the state in construction of outdoor recreation sites and projects; working together rather than on individual bases.

At the conclusion of Mr. Bell's presentation, Mr. Francis stated the TAC and staff would review the DNR suggestions along with others being made to update and further refine the Procedural Guidelines of the IAC.

James Brigham, Department of Game: Confining his remarks to the permits required for development projects funded through the IAC by the Dept. of Game, Mr. Brigham commented on the boat launching facilities placed on various bodies of water by the Game Department. Permits he referred to were: Shoreline management, Corps of Engrs., Flood Control, and Hydraulic permits. He noted an 89 to 94 days wait for obtaining a shoreline management permit, with the Game Department averaging 120 days from the time of initiating the application to actually being able to commence construction on projects. Corps permits average a waiting period of about 120 days also; Flood control, 3 weeks wait, and hydraulic permits, one or two weeks waiting period.

James Webster, Representative for Local Agencies: Mr. Webster remarked the state agencies had covered completely the necessity for permits and those which are required; that the local agencies were in much the same position. He expanded upon the various other permits, i.e., coast guard, water rights, FAA permits, building permits, etc.

Chairman Bishop asked for discussion. Mr. Biggs noted the emphasis being placed on the length of time to obtain permits which most felt has been caused by the Shoreline Management Act. The Act, he stated, does call for approximately an 84-day period to allow for necessary public hearings or public meetings, and to obtain public input and comment on contemplated projects. The hearings actually have nothing to do with obtaining the permit itself, but are a necessary element in assuring the public of input, not only as to environmental aspects, but other factors as well. Further, most of the permits mentioned in the presentations by state and local agencies representatives were not new to the present program, but have been required for many years. He explained the environmental process within his agency as mentioned by Mr. Bowen, whereby an applicant may request and receive service from the Department of Ecology in reviewing and obtaining permits required for certain projects. He urged that state agencies as well as local agencies avail themselves of this service.

Mr. Odegard then pointed out the construction time involved for most projects and the scheduling of staff in reviewing, evaluating and qualifying projects for participation in the grant-in-aid program. All of these matters take time. He suggested the Committee direct a legislative committee to work with federal, state, local, private and those agencies in state government in reviewing those permits and other control factors which are now required to determine whether some of the elements could not be combined or deleted, etc.

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. ANDERSON, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE REQUEST THE PROPER LEGISLATIVE BODY TO MAKE AN INTERIM STUDY INVOLVING THE PROPER PEOPLE FROM PRIVATE ENTITIES, PUBLIC AND STATE GOVERNMENT, AND THE VARIOUS LEVELS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, TO STUDY THE MATTER OF CONTROL FACTORS PLACED UPON THESE ENTITIES PERTAINING TO ENVIRONMENTAL AND OR OTHER TYPES OF PERMITS AND MATTERS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN, IN ORDER TO COORDINATE AND IMPROVE THE SYSTEM FOR ALL THESE INTERESTED AND INVOLVED GOVERNING BODIES.

Mr. Moos suggested taking the matter to the Governor's Sub-Cabinet on Natural Resources rather than through a legislative committee, and advise state agencies of the procedure available through the Department of Ecology. Most agencies are not aware of the service as outlined by Mr. Biggs. In the following discussion, it was brought out that local agencies need to be made aware of the procedures also and this might not be the case unless a legislative body was involved to make a thorough study. Mr. Ross felt the legislative process would help resolve more than just the permit problem and there would be opportunity to review the whole gamut of environmental controls. Mr. Odegaard agreed, but felt the Governor's Sub-Cabinet on Natural Resources could also be involved as one of the groups in the study.

Carl Crouse stated he would vote against the motion. It was his feeling the Inter-agency Committee was formed to assist governmental entities in acquiring and/or developing outdoor recreation land and it was not its responsibility to investigate matters of this nature. However, he did feel the matter should be reviewed to assist in making it easier for local governments to work within the system; how this should be done was the question. Willa Mylroie pointed out there was also a Governor's Transportation Sub-Cabinet which should be involved.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. THREE MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR: FIVE VOTED AGAINST. THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A MAJORITY VOTE.

Mr. Bishop stated the Interagency Committee members serving on the Governor's Natural Resources Sub-Cabinet should bring the problems discussed before that Sub-Cabinet as a start toward resolution of some of the legislative amendments and/or action which might be required to effect relief for state and local agencies in the many environmental control factors presently in the laws.

Procedural Guidelines: Mr. Odegaard inquired about the intentions of staff in having the Procedural Guidelines rewritten or revised. Mr. Francis stated there was an on-going need to have the guidelines reviewed and updated by the TAC and staff, and a process by which this could be accomplished. Mr. Ross asked that there be input from the various Indian Tribes who are qualified recipients. New laws and procedures will be incorporated into the guidelines through the proposed review and study.

III A. Technical Advisory Committee: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, "Technical Advisory Committee appointments - proposed", and gave an overview of the functions of the Committee at present, the role of the Administrator, and qualifications and terms of the members. The following recommendations were made for appointment to the TAC:

- (1) Barney Wilson, Director, Parks and Rec., Kent - to fill remaining term of Dick Mullins. (Term to expire May 22, 1977)
- (2) James Webster, Asst. Director, Park and Rec. Dept., King County - reappointment to May 22, 1978. (Represent county 50,000 or more population.)
- (3) Art McCartan, Whitman County Park Board - reappointment to May 22, 1978. (Represent county of under 50,000 population.)

- (4) Bill Hutsinpiller, Supt., Park and Rec. Dept., Yakima - reappointment to May 22, 1978. (Represent city of 20,000 or more in population.)

All of the above appointments were coordinated with the Association of Washington Cities and/or the Washington Association of Counties.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS TO FILL THE FOUR LOCAL AGENCY VACANCIES ON THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE BY APPROVING THE FOLLOWING MEMBERS AND TERMS:

BARNEY WILSON	CITY OF KENT	EXPIRE MAY 22, 1977
JAMES WEBSTER	KING COUNTY	" MAY 22, 1978
ART McCARTAN	WHITMAN COUNTY	" MAY 22, 1978
WILLIAM HUTSINPILLER	CITY OF YAKIMA	" MAY 22, 1978

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Francis then introduced the following members of the TAC present at the meeting: James Webster, Bill Hutsinpiller, Kenneth Hertz, Art McCartan, Lynn Martin, Merlin Smith, Al O'Donnell, Jim Brigham, Richard Costello, Beecher Snipes, Willa Mylroie, and E. E. Allen (alternate for Maurice Lundy, BOR).

III B. Dept. of Game, Nisqually Delta-Luhr, IAC #70-606A, Conversion of Use: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, concerning the Nisqually Delta-Luhr, Dept. of Game project. The Committee had directed the Administrator to work with the Department of Game to resolve the situation of conversion of use taking place on the property. (See minutes of December 9-10, 1974.) A brief history of the lease situation with the Dept. of Game and the Evergreen State College, the matter of a portion of the beach frontage being inaccessible for use by the public due to installation of a fence and posting of signs, and possibility of interpretive center on the grounds, was addressed by Mr. Francis.

Meetings had been held with all parties concerned. Staff recommendations are included in the following motion as passed by the Committee.

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

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS SUBMITTED A PROPOSAL FOR COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION CONCERNING THE CORRECTION OF THE INAPPROPRIATE USE OF AN IAC-FUNDED STRUCTURE ON THE NISQUALLY DELTA-LUHR SITE (IAC #70-606A) BASICALLY CONTAINING THE FOLLOWING PERTINENT POINTS:

- (1) TO PROVIDE A PUBLIC INTERPRETIVE CENTER UTILIZING APPROXIMATELY 900 SQ. FT. OF THE MAIN FLOOR OF THE STRUCTURE FOR SAME,
- (2) TO HAVE THE INTERPRETIVE CENTER OPEN IN THE SUMMER OF 1975 (IF POSSIBLE) AND THEREAFTER ON A SCHEDULED BASIS OF 1 TO 5 PM, THREE - FOUR DAYS A WEEK INCLUDING SATURDAY OR SUNDAY AND, FURTHER, CONSIDERING THE ACCOMMODATION OF GROUP USE AT SPECIFIC TIMES BY PRIOR ARRANGEMENT,
- (3) TO REMOVE THE EXISTING SIGN DISCOURAGING PUBLIC ACCESS TO APPROXIMATELY ONE-HALF OF THE BEACH AREA AND REPLACE IT WITH A SIGN DESIGNED TO INFORM THE PUBLIC OF THE PROGRAM ON THE SITE AND THE SCHEDULE OF THE INTERPRETIVE CENTER, AND

(4) TO KEEP THE GATE IN THE FENCE OPEN DURING DAYLIGHT HOURS ALLOWING FOR PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE PORTION OF THE SITE PRESENTLY RESTRICTED, AND

WHEREAS, IT APPEARS THAT ALTHOUGH ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED IS DESIRABLE, IT ALSO IS SUBSTANTIALLY DEPENDENT UPON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A THIRD PARTY NOT SIGNATORY TO THE IAC PROJECT AGREEMENT #70-606A, AND

WHEREAS, PERFORMANCE ON THE PART OF THIS THIRD PARTY TO PROPERLY IMPLEMENT SAME CAN ONLY BE ASSURED THROUGH THE AMENDMENT OF A CERTAIN LEASE DATED JULY 30, 1971, BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE AND STRICT ENFORCEMENT OF THE AMENDED LEASE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND THROUGH AMENDMENT OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE CONTRACT TO REFLECT THE TERMS OF SAID AMENDED LEASE DOCUMENT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AS CONTAINED IN THEIR MAY 6, 1975, LETTER EMBODYING THE FOUR MAIN POINTS LISTED HEREIN IS APPROVED AS ADEQUATE RESOLUTION OF THE NISQUALLY-LUHR'S CONVERSION PROBLEM CONTINGENT UPON WRITTEN AMENDMENT OF THE LEASE FOR USE OF THE FACILITIES BY THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE TO REFLECT THIS PROPOSAL AND CONTINGENT UPON ENFORCEMENT OF THAT AMENDED LEASE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME. FURTHER, THE IAC ADMINISTRATOR IS DIRECTED TO AMEND THE IAC CONTRACT TO REFLECT THE TERMS OF THE AMENDED LEASE DOCUMENT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

### III. Project Changes:

1. Local Projects: a. City of Everett, Forest Park Pool, IAC #74-046D, Cost Increase: Mr. Syverson outlined pertinent points in the memorandum dated May 26, 1975, concerning the City of Everett, Forest Park Pool, cost increase of \$186,708 (IAC assistance), or overall project cost increase of \$248,944. Staff had concluded the City of Everett might have been able to successfully construct their project with the original cost figure of \$368,466 if (1) the City had not changed engineering firms and subsequently authorized two redesigns in changing from the original outdoor concept to indoor/outdoor and (2) if, in the redesign efforts, emphasis had been placed upon conformance with the original building size projections. Staff therefore did not recommend the cost increase. Mr. Elmore, City of Everett, commented on the City's desire to have an enclosed structure to provide for year-around swimming activities. He recognized the time span of redesigning and inflationary aspects.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MRS. BROSTROM, THAT

WHEREAS THE CITY OF EVERETT HAS REQUESTED AN INCREASE IN THE APPROVED TOTAL COST OF THE FOREST PARK POOL PROJECT, IAC #74-046D, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$248,944 AND AN INCREASE IN THE APPROVED AMOUNT OF IAC ASSISTANCE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$186,708, AND

WHEREAS, REVIEW OF THE EVERETT FOREST PARK POOL COMPLEX AS APPROVED BY THE IAC AND AS REDESIGNED BY THE CITY INDICATES A SIGNIFICANT CHANGE WAS MADE IN THE SIZE OF THE BATHHOUSE AND SUPPORT STRUCTURES WHICH WAS NOT IN KEEPING WITH THE IAC APPROVAL AND CONTRACT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THIS REQUEST FOR AN INCREASE IN THE APPROVED PROJECT COST AND THE IAC SHARE IS DENIED.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

b. City of Tumwater, Deschutes River Pk, IAC #74-028A, Reduction in Scope: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, concerning reduction in scope for the City of Tumwater's Deschutes Way Park, IAC #74-028A. The City had requested elimination of a .5 acre parcel which it had been unable to acquire, and which it felt would lead to lengthy condemnation and the parcel was not actually necessary for the overall park site.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MRS. ANDERSON, THAT

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF TUMWATER HAS, IN GOOD FAITH, PURSUED ACQUISITION OF 90% OF THE LAND AS APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 29, 1973, AND

WHEREAS, NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE OWNER OF PARCEL #1-A TO DATE HAVE BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL AND THE CITY HAS REQUESTED WITHDRAWAL OF IAC FUNDING AND ALL OBLIGATIONS ON THE PART OF THE CITY OF TUMWATER FOR PARCEL 1-A AS CONTAINED IN IAC CONTRACT #74-028A, AND,

WHEREAS, THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT IN ALL OTHER REGARDS WILL REMAIN THE SAME, AND THE DELETION OF THIS PARCEL WILL NOT HAVE UNDUE ADVERSE EFFECT UPON THE TOTAL PROJECT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$6,600 PREVIOUSLY OBLIGATED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PARCEL 1-A OF IAC CONTRACT #74-028A ARE HEREBY WITHDRAWN AND THAT THE REVISED COST FIGURES FOR THIS PROJECT ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<u>TOTAL COST</u>	<u>REF. 28</u>	<u>LWCF</u>	<u>LOCAL</u>
\$ 55,490	\$ 13,872.50	\$ 27,745	\$ 13,872.50

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Odegaard asked whether the park would be a viable project without the corner parcel and was assured by staff that it would be.

c. City of Seattle, Queen Anne Hill Viewpoint, IAC #74-029D, Cost Increase: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, explaining that the City of Seattle was asking for approval of force account work above and beyond contracted construction and the contracted design and engineering. The City had requested an increase of \$10,460.41; however, staff supported an increase of \$7,471.65 since this amount reflected the approval of 11 of the 12 change orders and the force account labor of \$4,689. Force account design and engineering was not recommended for approval.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. ANDERSON, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF SEATTLE HAS, IN GOOD FAITH, PERFORMED WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT APPROVED BY THE IAC ON DECEMBER 17, 1973, AND

WHEREAS, IT APPEARS THAT GRANTING THE TOTAL REQUESTED COST INCREASE WOULD RESULT IN DOUBLE PAYMENT FOR THE SERVICES OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SUPERVISION AND WOULD NOT BE WARRANTED, AND

WHEREAS, CERTAIN OTHER PORTIONS OF THIS COST INCREASE REQUEST DO APPEAR TO BE ADEQUATELY JUSTIFIED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT AN INCREASE IN THE TOTAL COST OF THE QUEEN ANNE HILL VIEWPOINT PROJECT (IAC #74-029D) IS APPROVED IN THE AMOUNT OF \$7,471.65 CONTINGENT UPON APPROVAL OF THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR 50% OF SUCH INCREASE.

FURTHER, THE REVISED FUNDING FIGURES APPROVED FOR THIS PROJECT ARE AS FOLLOWS:

<u>TOTAL COST</u>	<u>REF. 28</u>	<u>LWCF</u>	<u>LOCAL</u>
\$ 132,095.65	\$ 33,023.91	\$ 66,047.82	\$ 33,023.92

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

- d. King County, Reinstatement of Expired IAC Contracts -- and, City of Spokane, Central Riverfront Dev.) IAC 73-019D, Reinstatement of Expired Contracts: ) IAC 72-040A

Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, concerning reinstatement of seven King County projects and two City of Spokane projects since the projects had expired on dates indicated in the memorandum. Staff recommended extension in each case to December 31, 1975. Mrs. Anderson asked if this would allow enough time for completion of the projects, and was assured that it would, as most projects were almost completed and lacked only some acquisition and some development -- not enough to extend the date further than December 31, 1975. In response to Mrs. Anderson's question whether staff had any written criteria concerning renewal of expired contracts, Mr. Syverson stated at the present time each project is screened by staff but there there are no specific guidelines to establish whether or not a project contract should be extended. Mr. Bishop suggested the Administrator have the Technical Advisory Committee review this matter when they review the Procedural Guidelines and other criteria.

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

WHEREAS, CERTAIN LOCAL AGENCY PROJECT CONTRACTS HAVE INADVERTENTLY BEEN ALLOWED TO EXPIRE, AND

WHEREAS THE COMPLETION OF THESE PROJECTS IS PRESENTLY BEING VIGOROUSLY PURSUED BY THE LOCAL SPONSORING AGENCIES AND IT APPEARS TO BE IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE STATE AND THE SPONSORING AGENCIES TO REINSTATE THESE EXPIRED CONTRACTS ON A RETROACTIVE BASIS TO THE DATE OF EXPIRATION AND, IN ADDITION, TO PROVIDE A CONTRACT EXTENSION FOR EACH PROJECT TO ALLOW FOR COMPLETION;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THE FOLLOWING PROJECT CONTRACTS ARE REINSTATED ON A RETROACTIVE BASIS TO THE DATE OF EXPIRATION AND ARE EXTENDED UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 1975:

<u>SPONSOR</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>CONTRACT</u>	<u>DATE OF REINSTATEMENT</u>	<u>DATE OF EXTENSION</u>	
KING COUNTY	E. GREEN RIVER III	70-077A	12-28-74	TO 12-31-75	
KING COUNTY	HIGHLINE PARK I	72-063A	12-30-74	"	
KING COUNTY	N. GREEN RIVER I	69-132A	12-31-74	"	(BOR)
KING COUNTY	N. GREEN RIVER II	72-042A	7-31-73	"	
KING COUNTY	LUTHER BURBANK	72-063D	5-22-74	"	
KING COUNTY	SACAJAWEA	73-061D	2-28-75	"	(BOR)
KING COUNTY	SEAHURST PARK	71-044D	12-31-74	"	

CITY OF SPOKANE	CENTRAL RIVERFRONT	72-040A	4-30-75	DEC. 31, 1975
CITY OF SPOKANE	CENTRAL RIVERFRONT	73-019D	8-29-74	"

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE ADMINISTRATOR IS DIRECTED TO PROCESS THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS TO EFFECT THESE ADJUSTMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

e. City of Chehalis, Stan Hedwall Park, IAC #72-021D, Reduction in Scope: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, and explained the reduction in scope being requested by the City of Chehalis for its Stan Hedwall Park development. In inspecting and reviewing the City's project, staff learned that either a major reduction in scope would be required to remain within the approved total cost, or a 36% cost increase (\$171,330) would be needed to complete the project as well as with a lesser reduction in scope. Staff advised the City on April 15, 1975, that the cost increase was not adequately justified and that the City should proceed with completion of the work initiated but not yet completed to date. Staff felt sufficient funds remained in the project as approved to accomplish this work. Staff consulted with the City and approved of certain elements which would provide a quality park in keeping with the intent of the project as approved.

Mr. Moore stated staff was recommending the requested reduction in the project scope, however action relating to the requested cost increase was not recommended at this time, but would be held until the August 1975 meeting at which time actual costs could be determined and presented.

In response to questions of the Committee, Mr. Francis commented on the project and attempts to generate local cooperation (local labor) by the City officials. Staff will continue to work with the City of Chehalis in trying to resolve the cost increase problem.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. ANDERSON, THAT

WHEREAS, ON MAY 23, 1972 THE IAC APPROVED AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE CITY OF CHEHALIS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF STAN HEDWALL PARK (#72-021D) AND

WHEREAS, DELAYS IN CONSTRUCTION HAVE RESULTED IN COSTS TO EXCEED ESTIMATED COSTS BY SOME 36%, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF CHEHALIS HAS REQUESTED A REDUCTION IN SCOPE TO HELP KEEP THE PROJECT COST WITHIN THE TOTAL APPROVED COST, NOW

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY APPROVES THE SCOPE REDUCTION REQUEST WITH THE REVISED PROJECT SCOPE TO PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS:

- UNDERGROUND UTILITIES
- SEVEN DRINKING FOUNTAINS
- IRRIGATION SYSTEM
- PARK ROADS
- PARKING LOTS
- LANDSCAPING
- FENCING
- FOUR RESTROOMS

(Motion continued - next page)

ONE KITCHEN SHELTER INCLUDING RESTROOM FACILITIES  
50 FIRE PITS  
30 CAMPSITES  
SIX BASEBALL FIELDS (TWO LIGHTED)  
PLAYGROUND  
FOOTBALL FIELD (NOT LIGHTED)

AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

f. Mercer Slough, City of Bellevue/State Parks, IAC #73-026A: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, and reported on the status of the Mercer Slough Project, IAC #73-026A. The motions of the Committee as passed on this project (Feb. 26, 1973; May 2-3, 1974) were reviewed. Based on these motions, the City is required to acquire all the parcels in Phase I and the project cost to be borne by the IAC is not to exceed \$764,815 (\$735,015 for land and \$29,800 for relocation) with any additional costs to be borne by Bellevue and/or State Parks. An additional \$67,400 cost increase to meet higher costs of acquisition due to revised appraisals and estimates for Parcels 3-4, 11 and 12 was now required to assist in this project. Mr. Francis, Mr. Joe Miller, City Mgr., City of Bellevue, and Nancy Rising, Mayor pro-tem, City of Bellevue, were asked to comment on the project. Because of complexity of the cost increase and clarification required for Committee members,

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MR. MOOS, THAT CONCERNING MERCER SLOUGH,

(1) THE ALLOCATION OF MONIES BE APPROVED LESS THE CONDEMNATION PARCEL SUBJECT TO THE VARIOUS PROCEDURES OF THE FUNDING THROUGH STATE PARKS (LEAVING THE REMAINING PARCEL UNTIL A LATER TIME);

(2) THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ASSIST THE CITY OF BELLEVUE TO THE EXTENT THAT IS POSSIBLE;

(3) THAT STAFF OF THE IAC PREPARE A BREAKDOWN OF THE FUNDING OF THOSE PARCELS AND OF THE PROJECT AS A WHOLE OMITTING THE ONE PARCEL NOT FULLY DETERMINED AS TO COST FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON TUESDAY, JULY 17, 1975.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III 2. State Projects: a. Parks and Rec. Comm., Fort Canby, IAC #71-504: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, and noted that in December 1974 the IAC had approved a \$620,000 cost increase for the Fort Canby Dev. Project. However, it was determined this approval was inappropriate as the action taken resulted in an over-commitment of appropriated funds, established by the State Legislature, for State Parks' 1973-75 biennium. Although Parks had enough cash available to cover the cost increase, their 1973-75 appropriation was not large enough to give them the authority to commit the funds. Staff therefore recommended that the IAC reapprove the \$620,000 cost increase from appropriated funds as established in the 1975-77 Capital Budget.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. CROUSE, SECONDED BY MR. MOOS, THAT

WHEREAS, ON DECEMBER 9, 1974, THE IAC APPROVED AN ADDITIONAL \$620,000 TOWARDS THE FORT CANBY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (#71-504D), AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS SINCE BEEN DETERMINED THAT APPROVAL OF THE COST INCREASE EXCEEDED THE APPROPRIATED FUNDING AVAILABLE TO STATE PARKS FOR THE 73-75 BIENNIUM,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY APPROVES THE \$620,000 COST INCREASE FOR THE FORT CANBY PROJECT (#71-504D) FROM APPROPRIATED FUNDS AS ESTABLISHED IN THE 1975-77 CAPITAL BUDGET, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT SHOULD THE BIDS COME IN AT A HIGHER AMOUNT THAN THE APPROVED TOTAL PROJECT COST, THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION, IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS PROPOSAL, WOULD NEED TO SCALE DOWN THE FORT CANBY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT WITHIN THE MONIES APPROVED FOR IT.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

b. Dept. of Game, Skagit River (Kathman), Boat Launch Dev., IAC #73-625D, Withdrawal: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, concerning the Skagit River Boat Ramp Development project on the Skagit River, in Skagit County. The site was acquired for \$25,822, 50% LWCF, and with Initiative 215 funding from the IAC. Construction drawings for the project were made, and in developing these, it was determined it was not feasible to locate the boat ramp at the location originally identified. Relocation of the ramp to a better location on the site was not possible since Game had not acquired sufficient lands from private property owners. Negotiations were not successful and the Dept. of Game determined to withdraw the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. BROSTROM, THAT

WHEREAS, THE IAC ON MAY 29, 1973 APPROVED AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A BOAT LAUNCH FACILITY ON THE SKAGIT RIVER, PROJECT #73-625D, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT IN ORDER TO PROPERLY PROVIDE A BOAT LAUNCH FACILITY AT THE SITE ADDITIONAL LANDS WILL NEED TO BE ACQUIRED NECESSITATING A LENGTHY DELAY IN IMPLEMENTING DEVELOPMENT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY WITHDRAWS THE SKAGIT RIVER - KATHMAN PROJECT (#73-625D) AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS. THE FUNDS HEREBY RELEASED ARE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR APPROVAL FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BOAT LAUNCH FACILITIES WITHIN REGION 3 DURING THE 1975-77 BIENNIUM.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mercer Slough: At this point, Mr. Bishop stated the motion relating to the Mercer Slough project, though it did authorize the staff to proceed with the cost increase involved, it was not clear to some of the Committee members. Mrs. Anderson had asked that there be a breakdown of costs available for review of the Committee prior to finalization of the motion as approved. Staff was directed to bring before the Committee on Tuesday, June 17, 1975, a prepared motion

indicating the various funding levels. Mr. Moos pointed out if necessary the Committee could reverse its action should there be a need to do so after reviewing staff's proposals on Tuesday.

c. Dept. of Game, Bogachiel River (Wilson Bridge), IAC #73-619D, Cost Increase: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, for a cost increase on the Bogachiel River (Wilson Bridge) Boat Launch Project in the amount of \$8,024 to cover additional costs encountered during construction as a result of additional gravel and riprap required.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MRS. ANDERSON, THAT

WHEREAS, ON MAY 29, 1973 THE IAC APPROVED AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME FOR DEVELOPMENT OF A BOAT LAUNCH FACILITY ENTITLED BOGACHIEL RIVER (WILSON BRIDGE) (#73-619D) FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$31,968, 50% REFERENDUM 18 and 50% LWCF, AND

WHEREAS, ADDITIONAL GRAVEL FILL AND RIPRAP BANK PROTECTION REQUIRED AN EXPENDITURE OF \$8,024 OVER THE APPROVED TOTAL COST, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS REQUESTED AN \$8,024 (25%) INCREASE IN THE TOTAL PROJECT COST,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY APPROVES A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$8,024 TOWARDS THE BOGACHIEL RIVER (WILSON BRIDGE (#73-619D) PROJECT TO A NEW TOTAL COST OF \$39,992, WITH REVISED FUNDING OF \$19,996 REFERENDUM 18 and \$19,996 LWCF, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

d. DNR, Howell Lake Dev., IAC #73-721D, Cost Increase: Mr. Moore outlined the request for a cost increase in memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, for the DNR Howell Lake Dev. Project. An additional \$10,000 is needed to provide funds to add crushed rock surfacing to the internal park roads and parking areas, and to redrill the water well.

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

WHEREAS, THE IAC ON MAY 29, 1973 APPROVED THE HOWELL LAKE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (#73-721D) AS SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$21,092 (50% LWCF; 50% REFERENDUM 18), AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES HAS REQUESTED A COST INCREASE OF \$10,000 TO PROVIDE FOR CRUSHED ROCK SURFACING ON THE INTERNAL ROADS AND PARKING AREAS TO REDUCE SEVERE DUST PROBLEMS AND TO REDRILL THE WATER WELL WHICH HAS BEEN CONTAMINATED BY VANDALS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE IAC HEREBY APPROVES A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,000 TOWARDS THE HOWELL LAKE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT, INCREASING THE TOTAL PROJECT COST TO 31,092, 50% LWCF AND 50% REFERENDUM 18, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

e. DNR, R. F. Kennedy Boat Dock, IAC #73-723D, Request for Scope and Cost Increase: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, and stated DNR required \$4,320 additional funds to provide for installation of boat tie up railings, 20' approach ramp and topper float boom logs for protection of the docks in the R. F. Kennedy Boat Dock project. These items were not included in the project; however, actual use of the docks indicates they are needed.

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

WHEREAS, THE IAC ON MAY 29, 1973, APPROVED THE R. F. KENNEDY BOAT DOCK PROJECT (#73-723D) AS SUBMITTED BY DNR FOR A TOTAL COST OF \$28,720; AND

WHEREAS, DNR HAS REQUESTED AN ADDITIONAL \$4,320 BE APPROVED FOR THIS PROJECT TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF TIE RAILINGS, APPROACH RAMP AND TOPPER FLOATS FOR PROTECTION OF THE DOCKS AND BOATER CONVENIENCE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY APPROVES A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,320 TO BE USED TO PROVIDE THE FOREGOING ITEMS WITH THE REVISED COST BEING \$33,040, 50% LWCF AND 50% INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

f. DNR, Indian Caves Camp and Picnic Area - Withdrawal, IAC #73-700D: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, requesting the withdrawal of the Indian Caves Camp and Picnic Area project of DNR located in Skamania County, due to the fact that public access to the site is not provided under terms of current access agreements with private owners. Since there has been no expenditure for construction on the project, DNR requested withdrawal of its development project (#73-700D). The agreement providing for the lease, however, will remain in force (#73-707A) to provide for consideration of a future development application when feasible.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. ANDERSON, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT

WHEREAS, THE IAC ON NOVEMBER 28, 1974, APPROVED AN APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES TOWARDS DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDIAN CAVES CAMP AND PICNIC FACILITY, PROJECT #73-700D, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE SITE IS NOT PROVIDED UNDER TERMS OF CURRENT ACCESS AGREEMENTS WITH PRIVATE OWNERS, AND

WHEREAS, THERE HAS BEEN NO EXPENDITURE FOR CONSTRUCTION ON THE PROJECT,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THE IAC HEREBY WITHDRAWS THE INDIAN CAVES CAMP AND PICNIC AREA, PROJECT #73-700D, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

g. City of Snohomish, Pilchuck Recreation Center, IAC #73-084D, Cost Increase: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, and explained the present status of the City of Snohomish's Pilchuck Park Development project. Staff recommended a cost increase of \$20,515 (\$10,257.50 LWCF and \$5,128.75 Ref. 28) be approved contingent upon the approval of BOR for 50% of said increase and amendment in scope as outlined by the staff. The City had requested a total cost increase of \$68,398 together with adjustments in scope of the project contract. However, staff felt granting the total cost increase would result in double payment of some architectural and engineering services, etc.

Mr. Rudolf Gast, City Manager, City of Snohomish, was recognized by the Chairman. He gave his explanation of the status of the project and the reasoning for the City's requested cost increase of \$63,398. Questions were asked by Committee members of staff and Mr. Gast. Because of differences in opinion between the IAC staff and the City of Snohomish officials, the Chairman directed that the matter be held over and that staff meet with the City of Snohomish to re-review all aspects of the cost increase and adjustments to scope of the project, bringing the matter back to the Committee for review at the August, 1975 IAC meeting.

h. Town of Tenino, Tenino Park, IAC #70-026A and #71-035D: Mr. Francis reviewed memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, concerning the City of Tenino's request to relocate its historical railroad depot to a site at the west end of the Tenino Park site (a site which had been partially developed with Land and Water Conservation Funds). The BOR had given verbal approval for usage of the site in this manner. Mr. Francis asked for Committee approval and concurrence in relocating the railroad depot within the Tenino Park site.

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

WHEREAS, THE TOWN OF TENINO IS INTERESTED IN RELOCATION OF ITS HISTORICAL RAILROAD DEPOT; AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPOT IS PROPOSED TO BE RELOCATED UPON THE WEST END OF THE TENINO PARK SITE (A SITE PARTIALLY DEVELOPED WITH LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS); AND

WHEREAS, THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION HAS VERBALLY APPROVED USAGE OF THE TENINO PARK SITE FOR SUCH RELOCATION AND WILL FOLLOW UP WITH WRITTEN APPROVAL IN THE VERY NEAR FUTURE,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION HEREBY APPROVES OF THE PLACEMENT OF THE RELOCATED TENINO RAILROAD DEPOT AT THE WEST END OF THE TENINO PARK SITE AND CONCURS IN ITS USE AS AN HISTORIC INTERPRETIVE CENTER.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III D. IAC Operating Budget, 1975-77: Mr. Cole referred to memorandum of staff dated June 19, 1975, and reported the following pertinent facts regarding the IAC Operating Budget for 1975-77:

- (1) One additional permanent position authorized for the agency -- RRS II.
- (2) \$818,732 agency operating expense -- represents a 3% cut by the Legislature of the projected Agency Operating Expense (approx. \$25,000).

(3) IAC Operating Budget Comparison 1975-77

	<u>Committee approved</u>	<u>Governor's Budget</u>	<u>Legislative Approp</u>
Full-time equivalents (FTE) (man-years)	20.5	19.0	19.0
Agency Operating Expense	\$ 885,808	\$ 844,034	\$ 818,732
Grants from Ref. 11, Ref. 18, Init. 215, BOR/LWCF, ATV (reapp. & new)	27,982,025 <sup>1</sup>	14,913,815 <sup>2</sup>	13,937,281
Grants from Ref. 28 (reapp. & new)	7,455,971	7,210,000	7,210,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes ATV funding at 4.61% of gross motor fuel collections, for both state and local agencies

<sup>2</sup> Includes ATV funding at 1% of gross motor fuel collections, for distribution to only local agencies.

Mr. Francis and Mr. O'Donnell commented upon the ATV funding. Mr. Cole stated allotment distribution information for the 1975-77 IAC Operating Budget would be developed for the August 1975 IAC meeting.

III E. IAC Capital Budget - 1975-77: Mr. Robert Lemcke, Capital Budget Coordinator, reported on memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, "1975-77 IAC Capital Budget". The changes made by the Washington State Legislature included deletions of Blakely Island (\$1,700,000) for State Parks, and additions of \$1,163,520 for that agency; no changes for the Dept. of Game; one addition for the Department of Fisheries (\$4,500 for Artificial Reef), and a \$125,000 addition for the Dept. of Natural Resources for County Line.

Mr. Lemcke also noted that \$1.5 million under "Grants to Public Agencies" had been included in the Operating Budget -- but this amount includes 50% of the appropriation for Wallace Lake addition for State Parks (\$250,000 with \$125,000 from LWCF); therefore, the remainder in the "Grants to Public Agencies" will be \$1,375,000.

1976 Supplemental Budget: Further, Mr. Lemcke noted the agency had requested \$300,000 (state agencies share) of "extra" Initiative 215 funds which had accumulated in the ORA. This appropriation was not made by the Legislature. However, at the August 1975 IAC meeting, staff will recommend a tentative distribution of these funds, subject to appropriation authority being granted under an anticipated 1975-77 supplemental budget request.

Blakely Island: The Committee discussed the Blakely Island project which had been approved as an addition to the Capital Budget at the February 26, 1975 IAC meeting. The reasoning of the Legislature was not clear although there had been some understanding that Initiative 215 funds should have been used if the project had been approved through the Legislature. Mr. Bishop suggested that the IAC Administrator work with the House and Senate Ways and Means committees toward a better understanding of the Blakely Island project, what it entails, the benefits to the recreating public, etc.

Mr. Crouse felt line-itemmed projects should be held to a minimum and that the IAC should work through OPPFM in evolving its Capital and Operating budgets;

otherwise, he felt IAC flexibility might be jeopardized. At this point, Mr. Odegaard explained the projects of State Parks -- General Fund items which had been transferred over to the Outdoor Recreation Account by legislators. The meeting recessed at 5:15 p.m.

TUESDAY JUNE 17, 1975

Chairman Bishop called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m., and introduced the following persons:

- John Belford, Port Manager, Port of Everett
- Frank Bennett, Director, Dept. of Community Development, Everett
- Honorable Pat Wanamaker, State Senator
- E. E. Allen, Asst. Regional Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation
- Thomas Wimmer, past IAC member and currently member of Seattle Park Board and the Appeals Board
- William Dietrich, Chairman, Park and Recreation Commission, Whatcom County

Attendees were advised if they wished to address the Committee, a Participant Registration Card was available to be completed and returned to the secretary.

Mercer Slough Project: Old Business from the previous day's agenda concerned adoption by the Committee of staff's recommended motion regarding the Mercer Slough Project as follows:

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BIGGS, SECONDED BY MRS. ANDERSON THAT

WHEREAS, THE IAC ON MAY 2, 1974 APPROVED THE MERCER SLOUGH JOINT PROJECT PHASE I FOR A TOTAL PROJECT COST OF \$764,815, OF WHICH \$735,015 IS FOR LAND ACQUISITION AND \$29,800 IS FOR RELOCATION BENEFITS, AND FUNDING OF WHICH WAS APPROVED AS FOLLOWS:

LWCF REGULAR APPORTIONMENT	\$ 191,203.75
LWCF CONTINGENCY RESERVE	191,203.75
STATE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION	191,203.75
CITY OF BELLEVUE	191,203.75

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT AN ADDITIONAL \$67,400 WILL BE REQUIRED TO MEET HIGHER COSTS OF ACQUISITION DUE TO REVISED APPRAISALS AND ESTIMATES FOR PARCELS 3-4, 11 AND 12, NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE HEREBY APPROVES A COST INCREASE IN THE AMOUNT OF \$67,400 TOWARDS THE MERCER SLOUGH JOINT PROJECT (#73-026A) INCREASING THE TOTAL APPROVED COST TO \$832,215, OF WHICH \$802,415 IS TO BE USED TOWARDS LAND ACQUISITION AND \$29,800 IS TO BE USED TOWARDS ELIGIBLE RELOCATION EXPENSES. FUNDING SOURCES FOR THE COST INCREASE OF \$67,400 ARE AS FOLLOWS:

LWCF FY 1976 REGULAR APPORTIONMENT	\$ 33,700
STATE PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION (REF 28)	16,850
CITY OF BELLEVUE	16,850

SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION TOWARDS THE RECOMMENDED INCREASE IN THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND CONTRIBUTION, AND

FURTHER, THAT THE IAC RECOGNIZES A COST INCREASE MAY BE REQUIRED TO ACQUIRE PARCELS ONE AND SIX WITHIN THE PROJECT DUE TO POSSIBLE CONDEMNATION ACTION.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

III F. Legislation: Due to the time element, the Chairman did not ask for extensive review of the memorandum from staff dated June 16, 1975, on Legislation, but requested whether any Committee members had questions concerning any of the items listed therein. There being no questions, the Chairman proceeded to the next agenda item.

[For the record, the 1975 Legislature took the following action on those bills which had been of import to the IAC:

- Sub HB 177 - All Terrain Vehicle Law - Became Chapter 34, Laws 1975, Ex. Session 1. Requires one percent of motor vehicle fuel tax revenues to be deposited in outdoor recreation account; authorizes IAC to use ATV monies for necessary administrative and coordinative expenditures.
- Sub-HB 204 - Eliminate motor vehicle fuel tax refunds. Did not pass.
- Sub-HB 206 - Capital Budget - State Agencies. Passed.
- HB 455 - Marine Fuel Tax Study - amending. Did not pass.
- Sub-HB 762 - Winter parking - creating Winter Rec. Parking Account. Passed.
- Sub-HB 855 - State Agencies Operating Budget - Passed.
- SB 2132 - Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers - Did not pass.
- SB 2348 - Trails expenditures. Passed.
- Sub-SB 2692- Establishes standards for buildings and facilities - accessible to handicapped. Became Chapter 110, Laws of 1975, Ex. Sess. 1
- Sub-SB 2242- Establishes Columbia River Gorge Comm. - Became Chapter 48, Laws 1975, Ext. Sess. 1
- Sub-SB 2616- Exchange of state lands and non-state lands - Became Chapter 107, Laws of 1975, Ex. Sess. 1 ]

III G. Arts Commission 1/2 of 1%: Chapter 175, 1974 Laws of Washington, 1st Extraordinary Session.

Mr. Francis reported on the memorandum dated June 16, 1975, concerning the 1974 legislation allocating one-half of one percent of State Appropriations for works of art in new buildings. The guidelines adopted by the Arts Commission and distributed to state agencies for compliance with the requirements of the law, would create a hardship on state agencies, and could possibly delay the closing of state agency development projects, final payments to contractors, etc., if strictly adhered to in relation to the smaller type structures which are funded by the IAC, i.e., restrooms, pit toilets, storage buildings, etc.

Following Mr. Francis' presentation, and discussion by the Committee, the Chairman referred this matter to the IAC Legislative Sub-Committee for further review and study to resolve the problems outlined in the memorandum. Mr. Bishop and the Committee members agreed art objects within projects should be considered, but there should be some relief for state agencies in regard to the smaller type structures. In place of Mr. Lewis A. Bell, Mr. Bishop appointed Mrs. Micaela Brostrom to the Legislature Sub-Committee which is now composed of: JOHN LARSEN, CHAIRMAN; WARREN BISHOP; MRS. MICAELA BROSTROM.

III H. Procedural Guidelines: Mr. Robert Lemcke referred to memorandum of staff dated May 26, 1975, and presented three revisions to the Procedural Guidelines, which

had been reviewed and concurred in by the Technical Advisory Committee.

03.03.020 Limitation on Applications: Applying only to local agencies, this proposed guideline would limit the number of project applications coming to the IAC: (1) Local governmental units with populations in excess of 100,000 could have no more than two pending for any IAC meeting; (2) Local governmental units with populations of less than 100,000 could have no more than one application pending for any IAC meeting.

Following Mr. Lemcke's presentation of the intent of the guideline (to help reduce workload of staff, processing time, improved higher priority projects submitted, etc.), the Committee members made the following observations:

Mr. Biggs felt the Procedural Guidelines should continue to be flexible; that the Committee should not tie itself down to where it would not be possible to consider and fund unusual projects, or projects which may unexpectedly arise and which should be considered because of their worth and availability.

Mr. Odegaard shared Mr. Biggs' concerns. He pointed out that the State Plan, with the various regions, is a defined document and staff already has procedures to follow in promoting and ultimately bringing to the Committee projects for funding. He felt the local agencies should not be restricted in this manner.

Mr. Biggs suggested that the staff develop some type of variance proposal and bring it back to the Committee in August under which if an applicant had an application which came into conflict with the guidelines, that that applicant would have available some type of procedure which would ultimately bring the project before the Committee for consideration. He did not want to become enmeshed in strict guidelines.

Chairman Bishop then stated the matter should be held in abeyance until such time as the Technical Advisory Committee had opportunity to again review the matter in light of the comments and remarks made by the Committee members.

Mr. Lemcke noted the other two guidelines which had already been administratively approved by the TAC were being presented only as a matter of information to the Committee.

05.03.000 Ineligible Development Projects:

- (10) *Development projects on land acquired after January 2, 1971, will not be eligible for LWCF (BOR) assistance unless the sponsor can provide assurances that it has or will make all payments and provide all assistance and services required under Part 645 of the BOR Manual with respect to uniform relocation assistance and real property acquisition policies.*

05.15.000 Architectural Barriers Act: (Amended to add paragraph on signing).

*All buildings built in accordance with the standards and specifications set forth in RCW 70.02 or containing facilities that are in compliance therewith, shall display the following symbol, which is white on a blue background indicating the location of such facilities designed*

for the handicapped. When a building contains an entrance other than the main entrance which is ramped or level for use by handicapped persons, a sign showing its location shall be posted at or near the main entrance which shall be visible from the adjacent public sidewalk or way.



IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. BROSTROM, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, THAT THE PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED BY THE STAFF OF IAC BE ACCEPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE (05.03.000 [10] AND 05.14.000 SIGNING PARAGRAPH).

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Procedural Guidelines - Implementation: Mr. Francis reviewed memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, and letter from the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation concerning a continued "Letter of Agreement" on site inspections of BOR funded projects. The Letter of Agreement formalizes for Bureau purposes the procedure IAC staff has followed in implementing IAC Procedural Guidelines 07.05.000 Site Inspections (State and Local Guidelines).

Mr. Crouse suggested consolidation of site inspections wherever possible with other involved agencies -- to hold to a minimum the necessity for multiple inspecting of the same site. Mr. Francis and Mr. Allen, BOR, agreed to this procedure. Mr. Crouse said other agencies make these types of inspections and he would hope they, too, could be involved on inspection trips.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. LEMERE, SECONDED BY MRS. BROSTROM, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE OF THE BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION ON-SITE INSPECTION LETTER OF AGREEMENT AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO SIGN THE DOCUMENT AS STATE LIAISON OFFICER FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

#### IV NEW BUSINESS

Funding Schedule Considerations - Biennium: Mr. Francis referred to memorandum of staff dated June 16, 1975, outlining the recommendations as to the funding schedule and dollar amounts for each funding session of the IAC starting with June 1975 meeting and carrying through to April 1977. The amount of money available is estimated as follows:

<u>Source</u>	<u>73-75 Remaining</u>	<u>75-77 Projected</u>	<u>Total</u>
Referendum 28	\$ 85,820	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,085,820
Initiative 215	601,613	592,965	1,194,578
LWCF - Regular	( 5,128)	2,857,035	2,851,907
Apportionment			
DNR Loan	170,000	( 170,000 )	-0-
FY 75 Deobligation	67,000	-0-	67,000
	<u>\$ 919,305</u>	<u>\$ 8,280,000</u>	<u>\$ 9,199,305</u>

Of the above total, \$2,857,035, is LWCF money anticipated for 1975-77. Apportionments of BOR money are not usually known until October of each year, and should not be allotted until the December meeting. Mr. Francis stated a net total of \$2,681,907 LWCF (\$2,857,035 less the loans from the state agency side of \$175,128) would be available and would require matching with \$1,340,953 of state money. Total: \$4,022,850. In addition, \$592,965 is anticipated from Init. 215.

RESERVE:	LWCF	\$ 2,681,907	)
	REF. 28	1,340,953	)
	INIT. 215	592,965	)
			\$ 4,615,825

For purposes of flexibility (to accommodate projects which may not be eligible for LWCF and 215), Mr. Francis recommended the reserve amount be increased to \$5 million. With \$5 million reserve, this leaves approximately \$4.2 million available for discretionary scheduling and use.

Mr. Francis proposed the following schedule and funding levels:

JUNE (APR) 1975	\$ 4.0 million
AUGUST 1975	-0-
DECEMBER 1975	2.6 "
APRIL 1976	-0-
AUGUST 1976	-0-
DECEMBER 1976	2.6 "
APRIL 1977	-0-

Mr. Biggs felt the proposal for funding was too stereotyped; that it did not have enough flexibility or give any opportunity to addressing worthy projects or unusual projects which might arise. He questioned whether the monies would be sufficient to meet inflationary costs later on. Further, it was his opinion that the local agencies had waited for an August session of the Committee and had planned to present projects for funding consideration at that time. He questioned whether \$5 million should be set aside at this time -- perhaps this would also narrow opportunities for reasonable review of projects and would be locking the IAC into inflexible system of rules and patterns.

Mr. Odegaard brought out the need for the local agencies to go to bid in order to commence their projects. Funding in December, he said, would be too late -- August would be a better month for local agencies. Mr. Odegaard also commented on the

LWCF funds. Though they are not known at the present time, the staff can make an estimate, fairly accurately, using past apportionment levels to the State of Washington. Mr. Odegaard suggested that \$6.6 million could be authorized for funding at this meeting -- funding all of the projects being considered. He asked to hear from the BOR about funding in August, as well as some of the local agency representatives.

Mr. Ernie Allen, BOR, said it was not possible to give any better reading in August on LWCF amounts allocated to the states. Until Congress acts on the budget, this is not possible. October would be a better month to anticipate this knowledge.

In response to Mr. Odegaard's question, Mr. Francis stated the IAC could estimate the dollar figures on BOR funds; however, this would be working on an obligation basis rather than a cash-flow. It would be funding through establishing of an estimate and then allocating the funds as they come in. BOR monies could be placed within projects pending available money for allocation. However, these funds could not be signed off until BOR funds were actually apportioned and available to the State of Washington. This could cause the local agency a period of uncertainty and would necessarily hold up any action by the local agency until funds (BOR) were actually available.

At this point, Mr. Odegaard asked for comments from local agencies as to the funding proposal. Mr. Jim Webster, King County, stated (1) his agency is planning a project in August; (2) agreed December is not a good month for going to bid; (3) disagreed with the suggestion that all of the IAC funds should be committed at this meeting because local agencies have projects already prepared for the August meeting and it would place a hardship on the locals.

Mike Caldwell, City Councilman, Lynnwood, explained the situation of his City in attempting to receive grant-in-aid assistance in 1974 when the August meeting was cancelled, and discovering later the project was ineligible for BOR funds. He felt IAC should adhere to its funding schedule approved by the Committee.

Mrs. Anderson inquired whether meeting dates of the Committee were set and could not be changed. Mr. Bishop explained the meetings were set up in the Washington Administrative Code but they may be rescheduled through direction of the Committee under the Public Meetings Act, with proper notification being made to the public and those interested in the meetings.

Mr. Bishop also pointed out the dilemma faced by the Committee in attempting to fund local agencies at each of the IAC quarterly sessions due to limited funds. As a result, projects are carried over to another meeting, taking staff time for these projects as well as new ones coming in. He suggested having one funding session for locals each year, at a time when the maximum resources available for all of the projects would be known.

Mr. Bob Bignold, ORB, Renton, was asked for his comments on the proposed funding schedule. He suggested early fall or early summer as the best time for funding so that there is adequate time for locals to prepare for Dec-Jan-&-Feb. bidding with contractors at lower rates.

Mr. Francis noted the change in fiscal year of the Federal Government from July 1 for FY 76 to October 1 for FY 77. He had proposed a December funding meeting to accommodate this change; but noted that either October or November would be possible. Mr. Biggs reiterated his objection to once-a-year funding and the

inflexibility it would cause in the grant-in-aid program. At this point, Mr. Crouse stated (1) it would be a disservice to the local agencies for the Committee to approve once-a-year funding and cancellation of the August meeting since it had already gone on record as proposing an August 1975 funding session; (2) Local agencies, therefore, had projects already on tap for submittal to the Committee and (3) some local agencies might not be in a position later on to acquire or develop those projects which they were submitting. Mainly he was concerned with acquisition projects where it would be necessary to secure property due to options and willing sellers.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FUND \$4 MILLION FOR LOCAL AGENCIES AT THE JUNE 1975 MEETING OF THE IAC; AND FUND \$2.5 MILLION FOR LOCAL AGENCIES IN AUGUST, 1975, AND

FURTHER, THAT THE STAFF PRESENT ITS RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE MOST PLAUSIBLE FUNDING FOR LOCAL AGENCIES FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE BIENNIUM AT THE AUGUST 1975 MEETING AND CONSIDER THE MECHANICAL ASPECTS INVOLVED.

Mr. Francis cautioned there would not be assurance of BOR funds at the August meeting. Mr. Biggs and Mr. Odegaard felt staff would have at least a broad scope of this funding and could recommend funding "subject to availability of BOR funds" as has been done by the Committee previously.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AND IT WAS CARRIED.

#### IV. A. Local Agency Projects:

Local Agency Funding Considerations: Mr. Syverson referred to memorandum of staff dated June 17, 1975, noting staff had processed a total of 48 local applications; returned six due to technical problems; and was presenting the remaining 42 for funding consideration. Due to the previous motion of the Committee concerning \$4. million funding, further explanation of the memorandum was not made.

Mr. Syverson referred to Tables I thru V(a).

Table I	-	Local Projects presented in order of ranking.
Table II	-	Local Projects by priority category
Table III	-	Local Agency Evaluation Ratings
Table IV	-	Local Projects recommended for funding
Table V	-	Local Action Program 1975-77 (Revised 5-8-75)
Table V(a)	-	Impact of staff recommendations on 75-77 Local Action Program

Following this review, staff made the slide presentation of local agency projects. Pertinent comments on certain of these projects follow:

Lewis County, Shaefer Park - Mr. Odegaard inquired as to facilities being provided for the handicapped. Mr. Dave Grant, RRS, replied there would be a restroom, covered sidewalks, and picnic tables geared to use by the handicapped.

Town of Warden, Volunteer Park: In reply to Mr. Ross' inquiry as to the estimated use of the park in the Town of Warden, Mr. Grant replied there were no existing park facilities in the area at present; the park would receive use of persons in the immediate area as well as travelers.

Whatcom County, Tennant Lake: Mr. Taylor was asked to comment on the use of this park by Mr. Ross. Following the explanation, Mr. Ross stated he would like to see some sort of "use study" for all future park projects considered by the Committee -- how many people would benefit from the parks being acquired and/or developed.

Kitsap County, Salsbury Point Co. Park: Impact of Trident was discussed on this project. Mr. Odegaard also inquired how many boats, car-trailer parking, etc., would be included in this project since State Parks had been asked to initiate boat launching sites in the area. Mr. Syverson replied there would be no special tie-up facilities -- that boats could be pulled up on the shore. Mr. Odegaard asked staff to secure the type of boating information he was interested in on this particular project and advise him later.

City of Langley, Phil Simon Park: Staff was unable to reply to questions of Mr. Odegaard concerning how many boats could be handled for access to the water and how many from a destination point of view. This information was to be supplied to him later by staff. In reply to Mr. Ross, Mr. Syverson stated the project would have an all-round year use, and that a higher priority rating is given to boat launching projects because some available IAC funds are restricted to such use. Mr. Burk noted this would be the only usable launching area in the south part of the island.

City of Winslow, Eagle Harbor Park: Mr. Ross asked for an explanation of the cost benefit ranking factor. Mr. Syverson replied this was a very general and somewhat subjective criteria, that the recreation field in general does not have good cost benefit ratio information which can be applied to every type of recreation project. The Evaluation Team attempts to determine if cost estimates are reasonable in each particular project. Mr. Odegaard offered this type of information to the IAC staff if they would like to obtain it from the Parks and Recreation Commission's office.

Clark County, Wintler Park: Possibility of Init. 215 funds within this project was questioned by Mr. Odegaard. Mr. Syverson stated this was a development project and should be funded from Ref. 28, whereas 215 funds are normally used for acquisition or development projects with more specific boating elements, benefits or facilities. The low ranking on "ability to proceed" was questioned. Mr. Syverson stated projects are rated according to their degree of readiness to proceed. Projects having preliminary planning only are ranked lower. Mr. Francis explained the waiver of retroactivity procedure whereby a sponsor may proceed at his own risk and still retain eligibility for funding of a project at a forthcoming meeting of the IAC.

White Salmon, White Salmon Community Park: Compliments were given to the City of White Salmon officials by Mr. Al O'Donnell, DNR, for their keen interest in the project and the strong local support being given to it.

Bainbridge Island Park District, Battle Point Park: Mr. Burk advised there would be access to the tidelands north of the site; that the county owns a narrow strip of land which is available.

City of Lynnwood, Lynnwood Swim Pool: Mr. Odegaard questioned the \$14,560 figure included for "bonds and set up fees". It was explained this is included in all of the development projects and is placed in the bids usually but is not generally spelled out as a separate item on the project resume sheet.

City of Mesa, Poe Park: In reply to Mr. Ross' inquiry, Mr. Syverson explained "access for all ages" to the park meant the facilities in this smaller community would be available and usable by small children, youth, and the older citizens. Staff gives credit to general use of a park of this type and especially when located in a small community where there may only be one park area available and must therefore be geared to meeting the needs of a large cross-section of age groups.

Skokomish Indian Tribe, Skokomish Recreation Area: It was determined by staff for Mr. Odegaard that this project was approximately a mile away from the Nalley property and the public would have access to the proposed Skokomish Recreation Area.

Town of Quincy, Quincy East Park II: Three points were given to this project for "use by handicapped persons." In response to Mr. Odegaard's inquiry, Mr. Syverson stated an automatic three points is given in this category to those projects where trails and paths are surfaced for wheelchairs and are thus available for use by certain types of handicapped persons to a greater degree.

City of Walla Walla, Veterans Memorial Park: Mr. Ross was interested in alternate funding for this project and asked whether the Highway Department could not assist in funding the project since it had taken some of the land for Highway use. Mr. Syverson explained the Dept. of Highways had already given 14 acres of land to the City in replacement and \$160,000 to construct replacement facilities. The City had already expended this amount and required additional funds to complete the park.

City of Lacey, Hicks Lake Park: Mr. Biggs inquired why this project was not being recommended for funding. Mr. Burk replied the funding level for the meeting had been reached at project #31. Mr. Biggs pointed out the last three (#31, 32, 33) had scored the same (203 points), and asked how staff could justify one of these over the other two. Staff replied this was strictly a monetary consideration since these projects were all grouped at the lower limits of programmed funding. Mr. Syverson explained there was a building on the property owned by a local church which was a point of discussion with Lacey.

At this point the Chairman suggested questions on this project, as well as all of the others, be held to a minimum to allow staff to continue project presentations due to the time element.

Port of Everett, Boat Launch Facility: This project was being recommended by staff at a lesser figure than indicated on the resume. Total cost of the recommended project would be \$521,000 rather than \$1,063,000 - with \$390,750 of Init. 215 funds to be funded for the project. Due to Corps of Engineers involvement and deadlines, it was necessary to construct the diking in order to take advantage of available dredging spoils during the fall of 1975. The time element was crucial. Mr. Odegaard asked if the IAC assumed this obligation, would the Port of Everett agree to returning IAC funds should it not be able to complete the project? Mr. Syverson replied the Committee could make this an added obligation if it was their desire.

In reply to Mr. Biggs' question that the project ranked 37th and was still being recommended by staff, Mr. Syverson noted the need for boating use in the Everett area and it would be logical to commence the major part of the facility since the Corps was ready to proceed and required a spoils disposal area. Mr. Biggs

stated he was pleased to note this comment of staff since it made valid his point of view that there are times when special considerations must be given to worthwhile projects.

Staff noted, also, that the Environmental Impact Statement on the Everett project was adequate and the project had been recommended in this respect.

Mr. Ross asked about the cost benefit ratio and staff's determination of it. Staff explained economic factors in the area could have given a higher ranking to the boat launch facility; and the need for this type of facility was essential. Also, projections made by a financial consultant had indicated approximately \$200,000 of the project in the future could be supported through revenue bond capacity. When the Port presents an application for further development of this project, staff would expect that it would reflect a \$200,000 figure coming from revenue bond sources.

City of Selah, Wenas Athletic Park: Mr. Biggs asked why the project was not recommended; in what particular areas was the project deficient? Staff noted (1) the park acquisition was not a major need in the area at present time since there were other areas available for public use; (2) according to SCORP, needs for this type of outdoor recreation facility in the Yakima County region were not immediate.

Mr. Biggs felt Selah was deficient in recreational areas and should be considered for assistance. It was then brought out that the Selah project was a good project but due to lack of funding ability and other more outstanding projects, it was not being recommended by staff for funding at this meeting.

Local Project presentations were concluded at 1:15 p.m., followed by comments from the following local agency representatives limited by the Chairman to three minutes.

Local Agency Comments:

Harlow Stordahl, Manager, Port of Kalama: (Transient Boat Facility)  
Felt staff had not given the project due consideration but could appreciate their efforts. The transient boat facility had been started through IAC grant-in-aid assistance and he asked the Committee to consider continued funding.

Robert Broyles, Project Coordinator Consultant, Asotin County: (Recreation Center)  
Felt merits of project were overlooked by staff; the recreation center would be only one of its kind for 14,000 persons in the area; specifically designed for senior citizens and the handicapped because of lack of facilities for these people; have funds coming from Referendum 29 and from local mental health group, and \$16,000 in donated materials and labor; the land is donated. Felt the year-round facility was needed and hoped to receive funding in August.

Merlin Smith, Commerce and Economic Development Dept., inquired why staff took points away from this project and the Kalama project for "negative characteristics". Mr. Ron Taylor, RRS, replied the minus figure for Kalama was accorded to planning criteria relating in part to the location of the ramps and no restrooms in the project; however, staff could work with the Port of Kalama and resolve their design problems. Asotin County negative points reflected the staff's concern for maintenance of the existing park facility and lack of any budget for maintenance if this additional project were funded.

Mr. Ross felt the IAC Evaluation System appeared to be having a negative effect upon good projects, and if the local agencies desired funds from the IAC, the

Evaluation System affected the designing of their projects. He had the feeling the evaluation criteria was causing local agencies to design their projects to fit requirements of the Evaluation System and not necessarily to affect what they really desired. Mr. Syverson replied staff did have certain design factors to consider; that this is a part of the overall review procedure for projects; such as making facilities more accessible for handicapped -- assuring facilities meet requirements within the laws of the State of Washington -- and meeting economic needs of areas -- minority area needs -- etc. All of this is within the Evaluation System and there needs to be this kind of system for staff to follow.

At this point, Mr. Ross suggested taking 5 or 10% of the IAC funds and placing them in a "contingency fund" or "discretionary fund", to enable the Interagency Committee itself to allocate funds for special projects which merit assistance. Mr. Francis explained the Committee already had the flexibility to make a decision outside of staff recommendation or the Evaluation System. However, the System is a decision-making tool for staff. It is recognized there is competition between projects -- comparisons must be made -- and there needs to be a system to meet those conditions. The Evaluation System gives some forty different items and represents the collective thinking of the Evaluation Team. The decision and ultimate funding of the projects rests with the Interagency Committee while reviewing staff recommendations.

Mrs. Anderson suggested this topic should not be discussed at this time, but held for later resolution. Mr. Bishop noted several members of the Committee had asked to spend some time on the various matters concerning the IAC -- i.e., Evaluation System, decision-making process, procedural guidelines, etc. He suggested this could be done at the August 1975 meeting, and agreed there was a need for these items to be considered especially when there have been new members placed on the Committee.

Mrs. Brostrom asked staff about provisions for the handicapped within the Asotin Project. There were none that staff could evaluate. However, the school building nearby would be used for programs for the handicapped, but that building is not eligible for IAC funds and therefore warranted no points in the evaluation.

Ray Jenson, Director Parks and Recreation, City of Selah: (Wenas Park)  
Wanted the Committee to be aware that the proposed Wenas Park application is within the in-city bike route, and within the last couple of months, the County of Yakima had informed the City it could begin looking into a bike route between Yakima and Selah, which would make Wenas Park a bike-rest-stop for persons using the route. Further, though the application was not being recommended by staff for funding, the City was interested in having an August meeting since the owners of the property will not be able to extend the option agreement on the property much longer. Mr. Pelton stated the IAC Planning Division was aware of the proposed bicycle trail route and has been working with the group in Yakima County on same.

Gordon Schultz, Chairman, Park and Recreation Commission, City of Lacey: (Hicks Lake)  
Mr. Schultz stated (1) there had been an error in the presentation -- 950 feet of waterfront is in the project as opposed to 95 feet. (2) The property was available in the summer of 1974; application was submitted in January, but there had been no funding session of the IAC until now. (3) An option expires in

September; most of the lake is residential development and land would sell quickly for private purposes if not acquired for part site. (4) The property owner desires the land's use as park and recreation area and the building on the site is worth retaining for public use. Staff determined only 25% of the building would be justified for recreational purposes; City of Lacey disagrees. (5) Waterfront owner will donate part of the land; and the City can't afford to provide more than 25% of the total cost of the site. Felt the building justified itself in total as a support facility; yet staff recommended only 25% or destroying it if it were to be fully funded. Felt the guidelines should be changed in this respect. Building will be used for students in local school district for interpretive programs; there will be joint use of these facilities. There will be day-camp use for retarded persons also. (6) Asked that the Committee carefully consider the Lacey Project, retaining the building as an outdoor recreation support facility.

Lewis A. Bell Resolution: Chairman Bishop interrupted comments from local agencies at this point to read a resolution proposed by the IAC members in honor of Lewis A. Bell. Mr. Bell was introduced, and the Committee passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS, LEWIS A. BELL, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, STATE OF WASHINGTON, HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THE PAST EIGHT YEARS AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE (APPOINTED BY THE GOVERNOR IN 1966) AND HAS ASSISTED THE CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT OF OUTDOOR RECREATION SITES AND FACILITIES, AND

WHEREAS, THE SAID INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION MEMBERS WOULD LIKE TO RECOGNIZE HIS DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DURING THAT TIME IN THE PROGRAM OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AS WELL AS SPECIAL ASSISTANCE IN FORMULATION OF THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS STUDY AND REPORTS, AND WISH HIM WELL IN HIS FUTURE WORK,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS ASSISTANCE TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER AND AS CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE, THE COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HERewith EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO LEWIS A. BELL FOR HIS SERVICE IN THE FIELD OF OUTDOOR RECREATION WHILE SERVING ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE;

AND, RESOLVED FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE SENT TO THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, WITH A COPY AND LETTER OF APPRECIATION TO LEWIS A. BELL.

STANLEY E. FRANCIS, ADMINISTRATOR	WARREN A. BISHOP, CHAIRMAN
MADLINE LEMERE	ADELE ANDERSON
MICAELA BROSTROM	GEORGE H. ANDREWS
CARL N. CROUSE	JOHN S. LARSEN
CHARLES H. ODEGAARD	BERT L. COLE
DONALD W. MOOS	MICHAEL ROSS
JOHN A. BIGGS	

RESOLUTION WAS PASSED, IT BEING MOVED BY MR. BIGGS AND SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE THAT THE COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY ADOPT THE RESOLUTION.

Mr. Bell thanked the Committee members for their action and spoke of his keen interest in the Interagency Committee and its activities over the past eight years. (Local agency representatives continued their comments.)

Robert Giesen, Manager, Port of Skagit County: Was surprised at staff's recommendation to not fund the project (LaConner Marina); one of the major purposes of the project was not included on the resume before the Committee -- the smelt fishing opportunity and "derby" held in the area. Felt would be vital park not only for recreational purposes but would provide fishing for citizens. Construction has been proceeding with waiver of retroactivity. Boating aspect will assist in reducing the pressure on other boating projects in the area. The Port Commission has reserved about five acres of land and it is hoped a camping area will be added in the future. Noted that Region III of the state had only two projects on the funding consideration listing -- one at Langley and one at LaConner. The Region has received \$400,000 out of \$64,000,000 expended in the state.

In response to Mrs. Brostrom's questions as to cost, Mr. Giesen stated the total project cost would be \$2,311,420, which would include dredging, transient floats, etc., and the \$224,748 from IAC grant-in-aid assistance was required for certain elements. Obligation bonds would not produce the necessary revenue.

Madge Long, Naches Park and Recreation District: (Applewood Park) Naches was funded by IAC in 1973 for acquisition; now desired development money. All matching money has been raised by community people who understand need for the project. School District is planning to build a new school adjoining the park. Naches application was carried over to this session of the IAC; cost for reappraising the property and bringing it before the Committee again would be time factor as well as cost factor. Eastern Washington has extreme heat, and the citizens require shaded park areas. Felt persons in rural areas do require park facilities as well as those in the city for leisure time activities. Urged funding by the IAC so that the City could begin development.

Sam Maxson, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Walla Walla: Answered Mr. Ross' questions concerning the Dept. of Highways and the replacement costs. Stated the City received sub-standard fill -- and \$160,000 in actual funds. Now need additional money from the IAC to complete the facility and make it the type of park envisioned in the project application. (Veterans Park)

John Belford, Manager, Port of Everett: Re-emphasized the importance of the Committee's taking favorable action on the Port of Everett's proposed project. Need to use dredge spoils when they are available. (Marina)

Mr. Merlin Smith asked why the dredge spoils needed to be paid for when the Corps of Engineers needed to find a place in which to deposit them. Mr. Belford stated it was the Port of Everett's responsibility to provide dredge spoil sites for the river, that there was no cost involved for purpose of the dredge spoils.

Robert Woerner, Consultant, Landscape Architect, City of Tekoa: Thanked staff for presentation of the project and for interest in assisting with the project. Introduced Tekoa representatives: William McComb, City Councilman, City of Tekoa and Mr. Waldo Hay and Mr. Dave Cohn. (Golf Course)

(Village Green)

William Mahan, Kitsap County Commissioner: Answered questions concerning Trident <sup>a</sup> <sup>d</sup> by Mr. Biggs previously. County attempted to obtain special funding but failed to receive it. The project entails acquisition of Village Green Golf Course.

Gary Peterson, Skokomish Indian Tribe: Gave history of the proposed project; no comparable facilities available in the area; the closest recreation site being about 10 miles away. Answered question concerning tennis courts; felt the project was extended as far as it could go and could not include these at this time. Will be second Indian Tribe project funded, if approved. (Skokomish Recreation Area)

Roger Loschen, Lake Forest Park, City Councilman: (Lake Forest Park Tennis Courts) Appreciated recommendation by staff for funding. Stressed critical need for tennis courts; project enhances an existing community park near school recreational facility; recent study concerning tennis courts indicated an additional 100 courts are required in this King County area; project has excellent access and there is park space already in existence with correlation with school program; Lake Forest Park was chosen as award winner for 1975 in this type of facility; and the project has had commendable volunteer citizens effort behind it.

Sid Hansen, Town Treasurer, Town of Clyde Hill: (Clyde Hill Park) Advised this was first funding for Town of Clyde Hill. Park will provide facilities for children and adult citizens. Thanked staff for assistance in preparing application. Appreciated being recommended for funding by staff.

At conclusion of the Local Agency representatives presentations, Chairman Bishop suggested Committee members restrict their review of the project listings to only those projects which staff has recommended, taking up others following that decision. If any member had specific questions on a particular project, that project could be removed from the listing for separate action. He then called for projects which the Committee members felt should be removed from the staff listing for later discussion (projects 1 thru 31, plus the Port of Everett Project).

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. LEMERE, TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS LESS THE FOLLOWING THREE:

PORT OF EVERETT, BOAT LAUNCH; KITSAP COUNTY, VILLAGE GREEN; AND  
TEKOA, TEKOA GOLF COURSE.

THESE PROJECTS TO BE HELD FOR LATER DISCUSSION.

MR. BIGGS AMENDED THE MOTION TO ALSO SET ASIDE THE LAKE FOREST PARK TENNIS COURT PROJECT.

MR. ODEGAARD ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION. THE LAKE FOREST PARK TENNIS COURT PROJECT WAS ALSO REMOVED FROM THE LISTING OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS FOR SEPARATE CONSIDERATION.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION AND IT WAS CARRIED.

MR. ODEGAARD THEN MOVED TO REINSTATE THE LAKE FOREST PARK TENNIS COURT PROJECT TO THE LISTING OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS. MR. ROSS SECONDED HIS MOTION.

Mr. Biggs stated he should have the prerogative of setting aside this project for separate discussion and explained his reasoning. It had an evaluation score of 203 along with two other projects ranking the same (City of Lacey and City

of Yakima [Lions Park]), and he felt all three should be given due consideration by the Committee. Further, he stated it was equally logical to review Thurston County's Guerin Park project as well as Lake Forest Park since Lacey, Yakima, Lake Forest Park had all received the same ranking of 203 and the Guerin Park project had been next with a 200 ranking and should probably be considered. Mr. Biggs suggested also that Naches should receive consideration as well as the Selah project. Discussion followed.

Mr. Ross agreed that the Lacey and Selah projects should be considered. Mr. Odegaard and Mrs. Anderson asked the dollar figures following the motion as approved by the Committee. Mr. Syverson reported as follows: With Tekoa, Village Green and the Lake Forest Park projects out of the recommended listing of staff, it would reduce Ref. 28 by \$175,123 and reduce the total staff recommendation to \$3,066,159. However, the Port of Everett was strictly 215 money (\$390,750) and would not reflect in the local project table being discussed at the time. If staff's recommendation had been accepted, the total funding would have been \$3,953,859.

Mr. Moos also favored funding those projects ranking 203 (Lacey, Yakima Lions Park and the Lake Forest Park Tennis Courts) and inquired whether there was any "contingency money" available to consider in discussing all of the projects. Mr. Francis stated there was no contingency money as such, but the Committee always had the prerogative of funding projects against monies which would be available considering their discussions of Monday's meeting. However, as he had previously pointed out, this leaves local agencies without monies for some time which might jeopardize their options and might have other adverse effects on projects implementation.

THE CHAIRMAN THEN CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON THE MOTION TO REINSTATE LAKE FOREST PARK TENNIS COURTS PROJECT WITHIN THE RECOMMENDED LISTING OF LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

At this point, MR. ROSS MOVED TO DENY THE PORT OF EVERETT PROJECT and was informed by the Chairman it had already been set aside in the previous motion for separate discussion. MR. ROSS WITHDREW HIS MOTION.

MR. BIGGS MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, TO APPROVE THE CITY OF LACEY'S HICKS LAKE PROJECT INCLUDING FUNDING OF THE BUILDING WHICH COULD BE USED WITHIN THE RECREATIONAL PROGRAM.

Mrs. Anderson felt the building in the Lacey project should be excluded. Mr. Biggs advised he had personal knowledge of the building, that it could serve a very useful purpose if it remained on the site; perhaps programs could be worked out for retarded and handicapped persons, and for the elderly people. Since it is an existing structure and in good condition, Mr. Biggs felt it should remain on the site. Mr. Syverson explained IAC policy on the matter of removing the building which is basically related to BOR guidelines where a present structure can only be one which provides support facilities, and recently interpretive centers have become eligible. Staff felt it could not justify the purpose of the structure using Outdoor Recreation Account funds. Staff made the judgment that 25% of the cost would be for outdoor recreation and made its recommendations on that basis. If the building were to be scrapped and torn down, the project would then be eligible for 75% funding from the IAC.

Mr. Moos stated the City of Lacey was short of funds, and it was a useful

building in the right place to be utilized within a park situation. He asked that the Committee carefully examine whether it should adhere to policy and require that the structure be destroyed in order to gain full funding assistance.

Mr. Francis acknowledged there was an inconsistency in the policies and that the Committee could not exempt these projects; enabling legislation does place restriction on these types of actions. The Committee could waive the

"In the discussion it was also brought out that the property would not be available for resubmission of the project at a later date, and that Lacey could not afford to bear more than 25% of the total project cost including the building (the property was not available without the building). Therefore, if not funded at this meeting at the 75% level, the property would be lost to other development."

(Anderson) for its complete evaluation of the Lacey proposal and stated the committee's job would now be to make the decision.

Mrs. Anderson felt the projects were being taken out of order and that she would like to support Lacey and the others which had scored 203.

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE CITY OF LACEY'S HICKS LAKE PROJECT INCLUDING THE FUNDING OF THE BUILDING TO ALSO INCLUDE THE VILLAGE GREEN PROJECT OF KITSAP COUNTY AND THE TEKOA GOLF COURSE, CITY OF TEKOA. MR. BIGGS SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

Mr. Syverson, at this point, gave the financial figures involved with each project.

MRS. ANDERSON MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, AN AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION APPROVING LACEY'S PROJECT TO EXCLUDE THE FUNDING OF THE STRUCTURE.

She felt the structure might be an integral part of the project and important to the success of the park, but it was not appropriate for it to be funded through outdoor recreation funds since it was a building not directly related to outdoor recreation use.

MR. ODEGAARD CALLED FOR THE QUESTION ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION TO EXCLUDE THE FUNDING OF THE STRUCTURE WITHIN THE CITY OF LACEY'S PROJECT. THE AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT FAILED WITH A VOTE OF TWO YEAS; SIX NAYS.

Mr. Moos commented on the Tekoa project, stating this was essentially a golf course and for that particular type of recreation only. Mr. Biggs then pointed out this large area of land was exceedingly valuable and if not acquired might be lost to other types of development.

QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO ADD KITSAP COUNTY VILLAGE GREEN AND THE CITY OF TEKOA'S GOLF COURSE PROJECTS TO THE LIST OF RECOMMENDED LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS.

THE VOTE WAS SEVEN YEAS; ONE NAY (MR. MOOS). MOTION WAS CARRIED.

QUESTION WAS THEN CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDED MOTION TO FUND THE CITY OF LACEY PROJECT INCLUDING THE STRUCTURE, KITSAP COUNTY'S VILLAGE GREEN PROJECT, AND THE CITY OF TEKOA'S GOLF COURSE PROJECT.

THE VOTE WAS SEVEN YEAS; ONE ABSTENTION. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Dollar figures on funding thus far were then given by Mr. Kenn Cole in response to question of Mrs. Anderson.

MR. ROSS MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, TO ADD THE CITY OF SELAH'S WENAS PARK PROJECT TO THE RECOMMENDED LISTING OF PROJECTS.

THIS MOTION WAS SET ASIDE BY THE CHAIRMAN IN ORDER TO DISCUSS THE PORT OF EVERETT PROJECT.

Mr. Odegaard inquired why the Port of Everett's project was being given consideration for Initiative 215 funds and not the Port of Skagit or the Port of Kalama projects. Mr. Francis stated the Port of Everett was in a position of having the river dredged and the spoils deposited on site -- a saving of about \$620,000 in the overall project. The other two port projects were not in this type of situation or able to capitalize on any dollar savings. Further, the Port of Everett's project was submitted predicated upon funding possibilities at this meeting. The Port officials have worked through the Corps of Engineers and the opportunity for the saving of \$620,000 will be foregone if not taken into consideration now, with the result that there would then be an increased cost factor within the project at a later date. Mr. John Belford agreed with Mr. Francis' statements and stated the Corps needed to dredge during Nov., Dec. and January to meet fishing standards.

MR. ODEGAARD MOVED, SECONDED BY MRS. ANDERSON, TO APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO FUND THE PORT OF EVERETT PROJECT WITH THE PROVISO THAT THE PORT IF UNABLE TO COMPLETE THE PROJECT IN ORDER TO MAKE IT A VIABLE PROJECT FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION WOULD RETURN ALL FUNDS REIMBURSED TO IT BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT REGARDLESS OF WHETHER THOSE FUNDS CAME FROM INITIATIVE 215 OR OTHER OUTDOOR RECREATION FUNDS.

THE APPROVED FUNDING FOR THE PORT OF EVERETT TO BE AS FOLLOWS:

<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>INITIATIVE 215</u>	<u>PORT OF EVERETT</u>
\$ 521,000	\$ 390,750	\$ 130,250

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

THE CHAIRMAN THEN OPENED DISCUSSION ON MR. ROSS' MOTION TO ADD THE CITY OF SELAH'S WENAS PARK, TO THE LIST OF RECOMMENDED PROJECTS. MR. ODEGAARD HAD SECONDED THIS MOTION. REFERENDUM 28 FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$51,300 WERE INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION. SIX YEAS; ONE NAY; ONE ABSTENTION. MOTION WAS CARRIED. (Funding on this project was later changed to \$8,550 Ref. 28 and \$42,750 BOR.)

Mr. Biggs stated he was impressed with the Naches Park and Recreation's project and their potential park facilities, and MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. MOOS, TO FUND THE NACHES PARK AND RECREATION DISTRICT PROJECT, APPLEWOOD PARK:

<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>REFERENDUM 28</u>	<u>LWCF</u>	<u>NACHES P&amp;R DIST.</u>
\$ 275,000	\$ 68,750	\$ 137,500	\$ 68,750

THE VOTE WAS SEVEN YEAS; ONE OPPOSED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Francis pointed out this was a two year project for the Naches Park and Recreation District in bringing about acquisition of the in-holdings between the two

parcels of land acquired -- entire park site would now be developed and be available for this community.

In response to Mrs. Lemere's question on the present funding, Mr. Cole stated the Committee had funded approximately \$245,000 beyond the project expenditures recommended for this particular meeting by staff.

MR. CROUSE MOVED, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, TO FUND AS MANY AS POSSIBLE OF THE LOCAL AGENCY PROJECTS APPROVED AT THE MEETING AGAINST BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION MONIES WHICH WILL BECOME AVAILABLE WITHIN THE NEXT SEVERAL MONTHS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

As a result of Committee action, the local agency projects as listed on page 43 and page 44 of these minutes were approved for funding by the following motion:

THEREFORE, THE COMMITTEE BY ITS ACTION AT THIS MEETING, APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGES 43-44 OF THESE MINUTES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN AS ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN ITS APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. B. - State Agency Project Presentations: Upon reconvening at 3:35 P.M., the Chairman called for action on the State Agency Projects being recommended for funding. The Committee members had had opportunity to review all of the state agency projects prior to the meeting and opted to excuse staff from the slide presentation due to the time element.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. ROSS, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ADOPT ALL OF THE STATE AGENCY PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF GAME, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND THE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AS INDICATED IN THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS:

#### STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE STATE PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY FOR EACH PROJECT, AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

LOCAL PROJECTS APPROVED BY IAC JUNE 17, 1975

Rank	Sponsoring Agency	Project Name	Acq./ Dev.	Priority Category	Eval. Score	Total Cost	Init. 215	Referendum No. 28	LDCF	Local Share
1	Seattle	Lieton Springs	1 Dev.	2	258	246,077		184,558		61,519
2	Lewis County	Sheafer Park	2 Dev.	3	256	161,664		121,248		40,416
3	Warden	Volunteer Park	3 Dev.	2	252	87,400		21,850	43,700	21,850
4	Tacoma MPD	Point Defiance	4 Acq.	4	252	347,500		34,750	173,750	139,000
5	Whatcom County	Tenasant Lake	5 Acq.	1	248	472,800		236,400		236,400
6	Kitsep County	Salsbury Point Co. Park	6 Dev.	3	248	175,672	31,484	100,270		43,918
7	Langley	Phil Simon Park	7 Dev.	3	244	56,100	42,075			14,025
8	Winslow	Eagle Harbor Park	8 Dev.	3	244	82,104	4,105	57,473		20,526
9	Cosmopolis	Mill Creek	9 Dev.	3	243	57,000		42,750		14,250
10	Seattle	Discovery Park - Ph. 1	10 Dev.	2	242	563,350		422,512		140,838
11	Bremerton	Lions Field Pier	11 Dev.	3	240	45,600	17,100			11,400
12	Thurston County	Burfoot Park	12 Dev.	3	239	100,331	9,613	65,636		25,082
13	Clark County	Wintier Park	13 Dev.	3	237	200,180		150,135		50,045
14	White Salmon	White Salmon Comm. Park	14 Dev.	2	234	233,272		174,954		58,318
15	Bainbridge Is.	Battle Point Park	15 Dev.	2	232	171,100		128,325		42,775
16	Waterville	Waterville Pool	16 Dev.	2	232	327,160		245,370		81,790
17	Lynnwood	Lynnwood Swim Pool	17 Dev.	2	231	506,712		304,029		202,683
18	Mesa	Poe Park	18 Dev.	2	226	20,000		15,000		5,000

LOCAL PROJECTS APPROVED BY IAC JUNE 17, 1975

Region	Sponsoring Agency	Project Name	Rank	Acq./Dev.	Priority Category	Eval. Score	Total Cost	Init. 215	Referendum No. 28	LMCF	Local Share			
4	Kitsap County	Village Green	19	Acq.	4	226	360,000		100,000		260,000			
6	Vancouver	Burnt Bridge Creek I	20	Acq.	4	223	231,387		138,832		92,555			
4	Milton	Triangle Park	21	Dev.	2	222	88,480		66,360		22,120			
4	Snoqualmie, Town of	South Park	22	Acq.	1	222	9,750		7,312		2,438			
13	Whitman County	Elberton	23	Acq.	6	222	19,655		11,793		7,862			
5	Skokomish Indian Tr.	Skokomish Rec. Area	24	Dev.	2	220	36,128		27,096		9,032			
4	Buckley	White River Park	25	Dev.	2	213	120,824		90,618		30,206			
8	Grandview	Stassen Park	26	Dev.	2	212	107,160		80,370		26,790			
8	Tekoa	Golf Course	27	Acq.	4	210	58,000		34,800		23,200			
4	Clyde Hill	Park	28	Dev.	2	209	93,178		69,883		23,295			
5	Quincy	East Park - II	29	Dev.	2	209	114,580		85,935		28,645			
10	Walla Walla	Veterans Park -	30	Dev.	2	204	220,800		155,600		55,200			
4	<del>Leah Forest Park</del>	<del>LEP Tennis Courts</del>	<del>31</del>	<del>Dev.</del>	<del>2</del>	<del>203</del>	<del>53,764</del>		<del>40,323</del>		<del>13,441</del>			
4	Port of Everett	Best Launch	37	Dev.	3	197	521,000	390,750			130,250			
5	Lacey	Hicks Lake	33	Acq.	1	203	319,000	15,950	63,800	159,500	79,750			
8	Naches Per Dist.	Applewood Pk.	35	Dev.	2	198	275,000		68,750	137,500	68,750			
8	Selah	Wenas Pk.	39	Acq.	4	185	85,500		8,550	42,750	34,200			
TOTALS										6,568,228	511,077	3,382,382	557,200	2,117,569

OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT: \$ 3,893,459  
 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION: 557,200  
\$ 4,450,659

→ SPECIAL PROVISO:

75-503A GREEN RIVER GORGE - KUMMER - PHASE II: APPROVED ON THE BASIS THAT THE RESIDENCE IS TO BE USED AS A RANGER'S RESIDENCE; THAT THE BARN IS TO BE USED FOR STORAGE OF EQUIPMENT AND MATERIALS FOR MANAGEMENT OF THE AREA; AND THAT ALL OTHER BUILDINGS ARE TO BE REMOVED.

→ SUMMARY OF PROJECTS:

75-503A	Green River Gorge, Kummer, Phase II	\$ 63,325.50	Ref. 28	\$ 29,386.50	LWCF
75-505A	Green River Gorge, Jellum IV 73-75 Bien.	24,057.50		24,057.50	
75-506A	Green River Gorge, Palmer II 73-75 Bien.	82,125.00		82,125.00	
75-504D	Rockport Dev. Phase II 73-75 Bien.	50,000.00		-----	
76-501D	Green River Gorge - <i>(Phillips)</i> III 75-77 Bien.	<del>177,500.00</del> 88,750		88,750	
76-500A	Lower Crossing 75-77 Bien.	46,221.75		-----	
		<del>88,750</del>			

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY FOR EACH PROJECT, AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

→ SPECIAL PROVISOS:

CONTINGENT UPON THE TIMELY COMPLETION OF THE RECREATION MASTER PLANS ON ALL MULTIPLE-USE AREAS WITHIN WHICH INDIVIDUAL ACQUISITION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS ARE LISTED BELOW AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 03.10.000 OF THE IAC PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES.

75-730A FOSS COVE - EAGLE CLIFF: APPROVED WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT DNR WILL INCLUDE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LANDS TO BE ACQUIRED AS A HIGH PRIORITY PROJECT IN THE DNR 77-79 CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST.

75-729D	<u>YACOLT MUA TRAIL DEVELOPMENT</u>	)	APPROVED ON THE BASIS THAT THE DNR WILL
75-728D	<u>CAPITOL FOREST MUA SANDY HOOK TRAIL DEV.</u>	)	OBTAIN A FIFTY-YEAR EASEMENT FOR THE
75-727D	<u>CAPITOL FOREST MUA SKYLINE TRAIL DEV.</u>	)	TRAIL COORIDOR AT NO COST TO THE OUTDOOR
75-726D	<u>CAPITOL FOREST MUA CEDAR CREEK TRAIL DEV.</u>	)	RECREATION ACCOUNT AND THAT, IN THE
75-723D	<u>CAPITOL FOREST MUA MIMA FALLS TRAIL DEV.</u>	)	EVENT THAT MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
75-724D	<u>CAPITOL FOREST MUA LOST VALLEY TRAIL DEV.</u>	)	OF THE DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES DESTROY
75-722D	<u>SULTAN-PILCHUCK MUA ASHLAND LAKES TRAIL DEV.</u>	)	OR SIGNIFICANTLY IMPAIR RECREATIONAL USE
75-725D	<u>TAHUYA MUA GREEN MOUNTAIN TRAIL DEV.</u>	)	OF THE TRAIL OR A PORTION THEREOF DURING
		)	THIS FIFTY-YEAR PERIOD, THAT TIMELY
		)	TRAIL RELOCATION OR REPLACEMENT WILL
75-731D	<u>TWIN FALLS CAMP AND TRAIL</u>	)	BE PERFORMED BY THE DEPT. OF NATURAL
75-732D	<u>BOULDER LAKE CAMP AND TRAIL</u>	)	RESOURCES AT NO COST TO THE OUTDOOR
		)	RECREATION ACCOUNT.

→ SUMMARY OF PROJECTS:

75-730A	Foss Cove, Eagle Cliff	\$ 9,524	Ref. 18	\$ 71,476	In. 215	\$81,000	LWCF
75-736A	Yacolt MUA - Ed Haase Acq.	12,848	"	---		12,848	"
75-734A	Tahuya MUA - Twin Lakes Acq.	6,595	"	---		6,595	
75-733A	Tahuya MUA - Toonerville Acq.	4,068.50	"	---		4,068.50	
75-735A	Middle Fork Snoqualmie River - Mine Creek Acq.	10,945	"	---		10,945	
75-737D	Sultan-Pilchuck MUA - Upper Basin Dev.	27,000	"	---		---	
75-739D	Maple Hollow Dev.	36,050	Ref. 18	---		36,050	
75-740D	Yacolt MUA - Cold Creek Dev.	26,125	"	---		26,125	
75-738D	Okanogan MUA - Toats Junction II	10,000	"	---		10,000	
75-729D	Yacolt MUA Trail Dev.	50,945	Ref. 18				
75-728D	Capitol Forest MUA Sandy Hook Trail Dev.	50,140	"				
75-727D	Capitol Forest MUA Skyline Trail Dev.	21,145	"				
75-726D	Capitol Forest MUA Cedar Creek Trail Dev.	24,815	"				
75-723D	Capitol Forest MUA Mima Falls Trail Dev.	7,104	"				
75-724D	Capitol Forest MUA Lost Valley Trail Dev.	31,390	"				
75-722D	Sultan-Pilchuck MUA Ashland Lakes Trail Dev.	27,491	"				
75-725D	Tahuya MUA Green Mountain Trail Dev.	22,524	"				
75-731D	Twin Falls Camp and Trail	75,320	Ref. 18				
75-732D	Boulder Lake Camp and Trail	63,217	Ref. 18				

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

DEPARTMENT OF GAME

THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS SUBMITTED BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF GAME ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973, AND

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVES THESE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED, AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSOR AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR EACH PROJECT, UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACTS BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

→ SPECIAL PROVISOS:

75-655A COWICHE WRA: RECOMMENDED ON THE BASIS THAT THE STEEL-ROOFED HAY SHED WILL BE USED FOR BIG GAME FEEDING OPERATIONS; THE LOADING SHED WILL BE USED TO PROTECT GAME DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT USED IN THE OPERATION OF THE AREA; ALL OTHER BUILDINGS AND CORRALS WILL BE REMOVED; AND THAT THE OLD CABIN AND SILO WILL BE RETAINED FOR HISTORICAL PURPOSES IF, IN FACT, THE STRUCTURES HAVE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE:

AND, FURTHER, THE AREA MAY BE SHARECROPPED AND GRAZED FOR MANAGEMENT PURPOSES PROVIDED THAT PUBLIC USE OF THE AREA WILL NOT BE UNDULY RESTRICTED.

75-653A SUNNYSIDE WRA: APPROVED ON THE BASIS THAT THE RESIDENCE WILL BE UTILIZED AS A WRA MANAGER'S RESIDENCE; THE BARN AND OTHER OUTBUILDINGS WILL BE

USED IN MANAGEMENT OF THE AREA; AND THAT SHARECROPPING AND GRAZING OF THE LANDS WILL BE USED AS A MANAGEMENT TOOL PROVIDED THAT PUBLIC USE OF THE LANDS TO BE ACQUIRED WILL NOT BE UNDULY RESTRICTED AS A RESULT OF ANY SHARECROPPING AGREEMENT.

75-649A CHEHALIS RIVER:

AND

75-657A OAK CREEK WRA:

APPROVED WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT SHARECROPPING OF THE LANDS TO BE ACQUIRED WILL BE USED AS A MANAGEMENT TOOL PROVIDED THAT PUBLIC USE OF THE AREA WILL NOT BE UNDULY RESTRICTED AS A RESULT OF ANY SHARECROPPING AGREEMENT.

75-651A SKAGIT RIVER-BALD EAGLE: APPROVED ON THE BASIS THAT PUBLIC USE OF THE LANDS TO BE ACQUIRED MAY BE REGULATED FROM NOVEMBER THROUGH FEBRUARY OF EACH YEAR TO PROTECT THE BALD EAGLE HABITAT.

→ SUMMARY OF PROJECTS:

75-648A	Lake Bosworth	(73-75 biennium)	Ref. 28	\$ 9,500
75-656A	Gloyd Seeps WRA	(73-75 biennium)	Ref. 28	13,000
76-602A	Tennant Lake - Phase II	(75-77 biennium)	Ref. 28	76,500
76-601D	Cherry Valley WRA Phase I	Dev. (75-77 biennium)	Ref. 28	24,100
76-603D	Skagit River Boat Launch	Dev. (75-77 biennium)	Ref. 28	29,000
75-655A	Cowiche WRA		Ref. 28	372,500
75-649A	Chehalis River		Ref. 28	14,175
75-657A	Oak Creek WRA		Ref. 28	50,500
75-651A	Skagit River-Bald Eagle		Ref. 28	25,000
75-653A	Sunnyside	LWCF \$ 93,000	Ref. 28	469,800

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Following the State Agency motions of approval, Mr. Bishop opened the discussion to funding of one more local project. He was advised there was Initiative 215 money available -- approximately \$66,000 which could be used. Mr. Giesen desired to have the Port of Skagit's project considered by the Committee.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MOOS, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, TO FUND THE SKAGIT COUNTY LACONNER MARINA PROJECT TO THE EXTENT OF INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS AVAILABLE AT THE CLOSE OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DELIBERATIONS.

Mrs. Anderson felt it was not appropriate to use all of the Init. 215 funds in one funding session, and the Committee should fund only those projects which are considered by staff to be viable. Mr. Ross also spoke in opposition to funding the project, stating local agency project sponsors had already been heard and local projects had already received funding action from the Committee. Since most of the local agency representatives had already left the meeting, it would not be appropriate to fund another project and could possibly leave a poor impression if the Committee were to take up action on local agency projects in this manner.

Mr. Odegaard felt \$66,000 might not be of value to the Port of Skagit or make it a viable project. Mr. Biggs also stated it was better to fund on merit of a project rather than as a matter of fiscal need and monies being available at the end of a

funding session. Mrs. Brostrom suggested re-considering this project in August. Mr. Moos agreed with comments of the Committee AND WITHDREW HIS MOTION TO FUND SKAGIT COUNTY'S PROJECT. MR. ODEGAARD WITHDREW THE SECOND TO THE MOTION.

August Session: Mr. Bishop advised there would be a funding session in August and discussion of IAC policy, Evaluation criteria, Procedural Guidelines and various other matters which the Committee might like to review. He suggested the Administrator delete some of the review items from the usual agenda to accommodate this type of session.

V. Administrator's Report: Mr. Francis advised because of the special handling of agenda material for the August meeting, the presentation on Trails and ATV corridors could be better accommodated if held over until the December, 1975 meeting. It was the consensus of the Committee that this would be more appropriate.

The next meeting of the IAC will be at the Ocosta Jr.-Sr. High School at Westport. Committee members were advised to make reservations early in regard to motel space.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

*8/25/75 as amended*

DATE

*Warren A. Bishop*  
WARREN A. BISHOP, CHAIRMAN