

MEETING OF MARCH 30, 1979 OLYMPIA, TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONERS' BOARD ROOM

1. Meeting Called to Order, Determination of a Quorum, Introductions

Introduced Avery, Billingsley - first meeting attended; newly apptd. by Governor Ray Noel, Bennett, Baitinger III, from IAC staff (last two, interns)

Corrections or Additions to Minutes - one correction made. APPROVED.

Additions or Deletions to Agenda - None APPROVED AGENDA.

Resolutions:

Warren A. Bishop - honoring 14 years as member of IAC (since inception)

Helen Engle - honoring term as member of IAC

Certificates of appreciation (framed) shown to Committee by Wilder; mailed to Bishop/Engle later. Letters also sent.

II. STATUS REPORTS

A. Administrator's Report

1. Land and Water Conservation Fund
2. Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act PL 95-625
3. Legislation
4. Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service
5. Cooperative Programs
6. Audits

II B. Fiscal Status Report

Fund Summary of Feb. 28, 1979

Capitol Lake Project - G.A. - also discussed.

II. C. Project Services Reports

Administrative Actions reported:

1. Dept. Fisheries, Edmonds Underwater Pk 78-803D \$4,500 Ref. 28
2. Game, Tennant Lake WRA - Blythe 78-603A \$49,500 Ref. 28
3. DNR, Mission Creek Trailhead 79-712A \$ 952 Ref. 28
4. Parks & Rec. Comm., Deception Pass 78-512A \$400,000 (\$200,000 28; \$200,000
5. Parks & Rec. Comm., Haley Property 78-515A 150,000 (\$150,000 28; (LWCF)  
\$150,000 LWCF
6. Lynnwood, Scriber Lake Ac. Project, 78-071A, Cost Increase of \$6,656  
APPROVED; \$4,000 USED.

Project Closures report

Introductions: Dale Haskins and Glenn Baker of HCRS

II D. Planning Services Reports:

1. Washington Natural Heritage Program - Status Report
2. SCORP - Progress Report
3. Agenda Item IV C. Washington Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan, Schedule for Completion.

Sub-Committee appointed by Brostrom for review of ISSUE PAPERS:

BROSTROM, AVERY, BILLINGSLEY, AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SEVEN STATE AGENCIES IF DIRECTORS WISH TO HAVE THEM PARTICIPATE AND REVIEW THE ISSUE PAPERS.

(3) Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Study - Status

III A. Project Changes:

1. Game, L. T. Murray WRA - Umptanum Creek 75-613D - reinstatement of project  
APPROVED BY COMMITTEE.
2. Game, Sinlahekin WRA, Sheep Mt., 76-609A, Withdrawal of Project  
APPROVED BY COMMITTEE.
3. Dept. Fisheries - Master List - change  
MOTION TO APPROVE FUNDING OF ONE FISHING PIER IN PUGET SOUND  
TOTAL COST OF NOT MORE THAN \$852,000.

III B. Legislation

HB 236 operating Budget  
SB 2563 - HB 257 - reorganization bills of IAC discussed.  
SB 2357 and HB 565 - Bond Issue bills discussed. Executive Request.  
SB 2176 mentioned by Brostrom - state debt payments/7percent limit, etc.

III C. Off-Road Vehicle Enforcement and Education:

Presentation by Lovelady - request for MORATORIUM, etc.  
MOTION BY COMMITTEE RE MORATORIUM and other matters. APPROVED BY COMMITTEE.

III D. Appraisal Review:

Discussion of eligible costs - review appraisals - and appraisals.  
MOTION TO APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION THAT APPRAISAL REVIEWS BE AN  
ELIGIBLE PROJECT COST AND THAT THE COST OF APPRAISALS REMAIN THE SOLE  
RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROJECT SPONSOR. APPROVED BY COMMITTEE.

- IV. A. Dept. of Game, L. T. Murray WRA - Fringer 78-606A - new project  
MOTION TO APPROVE \$ 5,500 Ref. 28 total cost APPROVED BY COMMITTEE.

IV. D. IAC/Forest Service Off-Road Vehicle Agreement.

Presentation by Lovelady.  
1. ORV Phenomena and 2. percentage Forest Service  
3. Limiting Statues, Attitudes  
4. Recommendation and Considerations  
5. Agreement explanation

MOTION TO APPROVE NEGOTIATIONS WITH FOREST SERVICE RE THE AGREEMENT:  
AUTHORIZED CHAIRMAN TO SIGN. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION TO TABLE - FOUR OPPOSED; MOTION TO TABLE WAS DEFEATED.

MOTION TO HAVE A.G. LOOK INTO LEGALITY OF FIRST MOTION AND ACTION THEREIN.  
MOTION CARRIED.

Bulley requested A.G. Opinion be mailed to all IAC members and that A.G.  
expedite his opinion.

IAC Meetings Schedule. August meeting planned/November meeting funding.

AFTERNOON SESSION

IV. B. Participation Manuals #1 through #9.

NO QUORUM - BROSTROM, BILLINGSLEY, AVERY, ODEGAARD - DISCUSSION ONLY MEETING

Moore - reasons for setting up nine manuals rather than one Guideline.

Participation Manual #1 - Information on How to Obtain Grant-in-Aid Funding  
for Outdoor Recreation Projects

Participation Manual #2 - Acquisition Project Policy and Procedure

Participation Manual #3 - Acquisition Project Policy and Procedure

Odegaard's suggestions for changes.

Participation Manual #4 - Development Project Policies and Procedures Odegaard's changes.

Participation Manual #5 - Application Policy and Procedure

Participation Manual #6 - Project Evaluation System

Participation Manual #7 - Approved Project Administration

Participation Manual #8 - Reimbursement Procedure and Policy

Participation Manual #9 - Special Policy and Procedures Applicable only to  
State Agencies

Odegaard's suggestion re Master List - adopted immediately after adopted and  
passed by the Legislature.

Federal/State application - Odegaard's suggestion - consider other federal funding  
in manual some place.

Technical Advisory Committee - Administrator to check into whether can go back  
to former system of review by state agencies' representatives - state projects.

ADJOURNED 3:13 p.m.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

REGULAR MEETING

---

DATE: March 30, 1979 TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
PLACE: Transportation Commissioners' Board Room, Wing D-1, Highways Admin. Bldg.

---

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mrs. Elizabeth Avery, Vancouver  
Mr. Kirby Billingsley, Wenatchee  
Mrs. Micaela Brostrom, Mercer Island,  
Chairman  
W. A. Bulley, Director, Dept. of  
Transportation

Honorable Bert L. Cole, State Land Commissioner,  
Department of Natural Resources  
Ralph W. Larson, Director, Department of Game  
Gordon Sandison, Director, Department of Fisheries  
Charles H. Odegaard, Director, Parks and Recreation  
Commission

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Peter Wyman, Spokane  
Louis Larsen, Seattle

Wilbur Hallauer, Director, Department of Ecology  
Kazuo Watanabe, Director, Commerce & Economic  
Development

STATE AGENCIES' TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (TAC - STATE)

Rick Finnigan, Attorney General's Office  
Merlin Smith, Commerce and Economic Development Department  
Richard Costello, Department of Fisheries  
Stan Scott and Doris Gambill, Department of Game - for Bob Barnard  
Al O'Donnell, Department of Natural Resources  
John Clark, Parks and Recreation Commission  
Willa Mylroie, Department of Transportation

LOCAL AGENCIES' TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (TAC - LOCAL)

William Fearn, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane  
By Haley, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Vancouver  
Harry Laban, Seattle Parks and Recreation Department, Seattle - ex-officio  
James Webster, King County Parks and Recreation Director, King County  
Barney Wilson, Director, Parks and Recreation Department, Kent  
Dale Haskins and Glenn Baker, Heritage Conservation and Recreation  
Service, Seattle - representing Maurice C. Lundy, Regional Director - ex-officio

PLANNING ADVISORY COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (PAC)

William Fearn, Director, Parks and Recreation, City of Spokane  
Ken Heany, representing Tacoma Metropolitan Park District, Tacoma  
Dale Haskins, Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Seattle

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (ORVAC)

Ron Morgenthaler, Chairman, NW Motorcycle Assn., Issaquah  
Charles R. Butler, Yakima County Planning Department, Yakima  
Rolland Emetaz, United States Forest Service, Portland

STATE TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (STAC)

Loretta Slater, Chairman, Mercer Island, Washington  
Ron Morgenthaler, N W Motorcycle Assn., Issaquah

Al O'Donnell, Department of Natural Resources

1. Meeting called to order, determination of a quorum, introductions: Chairman Micaela Brostrom called the meeting to order at 9:22 a.m., declaring a quorum of seven. (AVERY, BILLINGSLEY, BROSTROM, BULLEY, COLE, LARSON, ODEGAARD. MR. SANDISON ARRIVED AT 10:42 A. M. - EIGHT MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE.)

Introductions: The following introductions were made by the Chairman and the Administrator:

Elizabeth Avery, Park Board, Vancouver, Washington - new member of the IAC appointed by the Governor - term ending December 31, 1981;

Kirby Billingsley, Wenatchee, Washington - new member of the IAC appointed by the Governor - term ending December 31, 1981.

James Noel, ORV Study Coordinator, new employee, IAC  
Rebecca Bennett, Intern to the IAC, Central Washington University,  
Ellensburg, Washington  
George Baitinger III, Intern to the IAC, The Evergreen State College,  
Olympia, Washington

Introductions were made as listed on pages 1-2 of these minutes of the TAC (Local-State), PAC, ORVAC, STAC advisory committees of the IAC.

Mr. Bert Cole publicly thanked Mrs. Loretta Slater, Chairman of the State Trails Advisory Committee, for her successful efforts in the passage of House Bill #50, relating to liability of landowners or others in possession or control concerning trail use. Mrs. Slater distributed copies of the bill to all Committee members.

Corrections, additions, approval of the Minutes of November 2-3, 1978: Mr. Bulley called attention of the Committee to page (28), Section II E., Paragraph 4, of the minutes of November 2-3, 1978, suggesting the following correction:

"Mrs. Mylroie noted that approximately \$1,000,000 per year is used for this purpose by the Department throughout the State for trails purposes and that ~~there is a meeting on the matter December 17, 1978 in the Transportation Department~~ a meeting has been set within the Department to discuss development of additional policies and guidelines for its trails program."

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2-3, 1978, BE APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE WITH THIS CORRECTION. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Additions or deletions to the agenda of March 30, 1979: There being no additions or deletions to the agenda, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT THE AGENDA FOR MARCH 30, 1979 IAC MEETING BE APPROVED. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Resolutions: Mrs. Brostrom announced the expiration of terms on the IAC for Warren A. Bishop, who had served from 1965 to 1979 on the Committee and as its Chairman from 1974-1977, and for Helen Engle, who had served since 1976. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD, THAT

WHEREAS, WARREN A. BISHOP, HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THE PAST FOURTEEN YEARS (SINCE 1965) AS A MEMBER OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION 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, AND WISH HIM WELL IN FUTURE YEARS,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HIS ASSISTANCE TO THE INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HIS RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREWITH EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO WARREN A. BISHOP 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 WARREN A. BISHOP.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

IT WAS THEN MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, AND SECONDED BY MR. COLE, THAT

WHEREAS, HELEN ENGLE HAS SERVED ON THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE 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 HER DEDICATED AND OUTSTANDING SERVICES RENDERED TO THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DURING THAT TIME, AND WISH HER WELL IN HER FUTURE WORK,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT IN RECOGNITION OF HER ASSISTANCE TO THE INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE IN PERFORMING HER RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREWITH EXTEND ITS THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO HELEN ENGLE FOR HER 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 HELEN ENGLE.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Mr. Odegaard in behalf of the Committee expressed appreciation to both former members of the Committee for their extensive endeavors in assuring adequate outdoor recreation areas and facilities for the State, and especially to Warren Bishop for his expertise over the past fourteen years. He noted that Mr. Bert Cole and he were now the last of the original Interagency Committee members.

Mr. Wilder exhibited two framed CERTIFICATES OF APPRECIATION to be given to Mr. Bishop and Mrs. Engle since all too often words do not suffice for the concerted efforts put forth by persons serving on committees in the interests of the general public. He felt both members had contributed to the progress of the IAC in its various programs and were deserving of this form of appreciation.

## II. STATUS REPORTS

A. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: The following matters of interest were commented upon to the Committee by Mr. Wilder:

1. Land and Water Conservation Fund: \$359 million has been budgeted for the states from LWCF. Of this, the State of Washington should receive approximately \$6 million. Mr. Wilder noted that funding for the states is about \$10 million less from the previous year which equates with Washington's apportionment being reduced about \$200,000 from what was received in FY 1979. He reported there were certain amendments being considered (now in draft stages) to allow the funding of covered swimming pools, skating rinks, and other selective projects. Also the matter of cost of appraisals being considered an eligible project cost is being reviewed. He noted that this matter would be a separate item in the IAC March 30th agenda for discussion.

2. Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act - PL 95-625: The Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program established under this Act will be administered by the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service. The Act establishes an urban park and recreation recovery program which provides Federal grants to economically hard-pressed communities specifically for the rehabilitation of critically needed recreation areas, facilities and development of improved recreation programs for a period of five years. \$33.5 million has been requested as a supplemental appropriation for FY 79. For FY 1980, \$150 million is proposed to be budgeted. Under the guidelines in the Act, seven cities in the State of Washington have been designated as eligible to receive UPRRA funds: Bellingham, Everett, Seattle, Tacoma, Yakima, Pasco and Spokane. The IAC has not yet been determined as the agency to assist in the program; however, staff is working closely with HCRS with the possibility of working out an agreement with them. Fifteen percent of the funds will be available for non-designated cities that will meet the criteria.

3. Legislation: Mr. Wilder briefly reported on legislation pertinent to the IAC, making reference to the memorandum in the kit dated March 30, 1979.

HB 565 - \$16 million bond bill: Bill is related to the Capital and Operating Budgets and thus will not be acted upon until those two items are resolved. (cf SB 2357)

SB 2563 - IAC Reorganization bill: In House Parks and Recreation Committee. 7 citizen members-at-large (one from each Congressional District of the State); four State agency heads (Game, Parks and Recreation, DNR, and Fisheries); two local elected officials - 1 representing cities and one representing counties. The name of the agency would be Council of Recreation Resources (would not eliminate the IAC, but change its name and structure).

SB 2148 - Supplemental Budget: Now Chapter 15, Laws 1979. It compensated for an over-appropriation of Referendum 28 monies from the state agencies' portion (\$720,643), and provided appropriation authority for the State Finance Comm. to sell the remaining Ref. 28 bonds (\$3.8 million for local agency grants).

4. Heritage Conservation Recreation Service: Program audit has been completed by HCRS of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation. HCRS was impressed with IAC administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund program. Mr. Wilder felt this was a credit to the staff and the Committee in the manner in which it gives guidance to the HCRS program.

5. Cooperative Programs: Mr. Wilder mentioned various meetings held recently including one on special population programs -- needs of the handicapped, etc. Also Federal and state agencies have been brought together for discussions of their problems, programs and priorities for the coming year.

6. Audits: Mr. Wilder reported the mood at the Congressional level permeating down through the Service and to the states is that it is a time of austerity, a time of audits, and it is anticipated there will be considerably more audits than in prior years. Some of the state agencies will be audited and the IAC staff will assist state agencies in advance to assure that they are conforming with the Land and Water Conservation Fund requirements.

II. B. FISCAL STATUS REPORT: Mr. Kenn Cole, Chief, Management Services, reported on the Fund Summary dated February 28, 1979, noting the balances of each state agency and the various funding sources. Mr. Bert Cole asked about the deficit of \$114,068.24 in Referendum 18 for the Department of Natural Resources, and was informed that the IAC staff have been working with DNR staff to resolve this matter. Savings not yet recognized on DNR projects will erase the deficit since it is a matter of completing the final paperwork for various projects, and in some cases final inspections.

Bert Cole questioned the \$720,643. deficit indicated for the Department of General Administration. He was informed that this matter would be resolved through the Supplemental Budget procedure. Mr. Kenn Cole assured the Committee that Initiative 215 funds would be used for the GA Capitol Lake Project and that boating would be re-occurring on the lake since it would be deep enough once again to accommodate boating activities following the dredging. Mr. Bulley clarified the Department of Highways' project at Capitol Lake, which is separate work from that being accomplished by the Department of General Administration. Mr. Odegard asked if the Administrator was satisfied that the source of the funds for the Capitol Lake Project and the restrictions placed upon them would stand up to an audit. Mr. Wilder informed him staff was satisfied and, in fact, this was the purpose of the Supplemental Budget request which had been approved through the State Legislature.

II. C. PROJECT SERVICES REPORTS: Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, entitled "Project Services Division - Administrative Actions/Project Closures", and noted that the following State Agency Master List Project Approvals were made by the Administrator since the last meeting of the IAC:

Dept. of Fisheries - Edmonds Underwater Park - #78-803D \$ 4,500 Ref. 28  
Construction of fish habitat, anchored safety and rest floats, underwater marking system, surface buoys, near Edmonds Fishing Pier.

Department of Game - Tennant Lake WRA - Blythe - #78-603A \$ 49,500 Ref. 28  
Acquisition of approximately 50 acres of land, west/north shores of Tennant Lake.

Department of Natural Resources - Mission Creek Trailhead #79-712A - \$952,000  
Acquisition (50-year lease) of .49 acres of State Trust Lands - Ref. 28  
 trailhead within Tahuya Multiple-Use Area, Mason County

State Parks - Deception Pass #78-512A (\$200,000 Ref. 28; \$400,000  
 200,000 LWCF)

Acquire approximately 210.5 acres in Pass Lake area Deception Pass State Park, Skagit County.

State Parks - Haley Property - #78-515A (\$150,000 Ref. 28; \$300,000  
 150,000 LWCF)

Acquire approximately 50 acres of upland and 1,000' of waterfront on Case Inlet in Pierce County for day-use regional park.

Mr. Moore explained for the benefit of the new IAC members that the state agencies' capital projects are approved through the Capital Budget system by the State Legislature. The Committee approves a Master List of those projects, and once the material is submitted to staff of the IAC, the administrator through the Projects' Services Division administratively approves them if they are in keeping with the Master List.

The Lynnwood, Scriber Lake Acquisition project, #78-071A, cost increase, was then explained by Mr. Moore. A cost increase in the amount of \$6,656 was approved to add unanticipated relocation costs to this 18.5 acre acquisition. Subsequently, it was determined that a maximum of \$4,000 of this increase was needed to accommodate the actual costs and the final payment to the City was based on the lesser amount.

Project Closures: Mr. Moore noted the following number of state and local projects closed between November 1, 1978 to March 1, 1979, and those still active:

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Number of projects closed</u>	<u>Number currently active</u>
Department of Natural Resources	6	50
State Parks and Recreation Commission	4	20
Department of Fisheries	0	5
Department of Game	3	46
Department of General Administration	0	2
All Local Agencies	11	85
	<u>24</u>	<u>208</u>

Again, for the benefit of Mrs. Avery and Mr. Billingsley, Mr. Wilder explained the Administrator's authority to review cost increases and approve them up to a 10% limit. Any cost increases administratively approved are then brought back to the Committee for their information and/or discussion. Mr. Wilder stressed that cost increases are carefully screened and should there be a large cost increase request even within the ten percent, in his role as Administrator such a cost increase would be brought back to the Committee for review and approval.

INTRODUCTIONS: Mr. Wilder introduced the following persons:

- Mr. Dale Haskins, Planning Unit of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service
- Mr. Glenn Baker, Projects Unit of the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service

II. D. PLANNING SERVICES REPORTS:

(2) Washington Natural Heritage Program - Status Report: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum concerning the Washington Natural Heritage Program, dated March 30, 1979, and reported as follows: (a) gathering of certain rare plant information, rare animals, and plant community elements are on schedule; (b) emphasis is now being placed on placing the information within a workable computer format and data flow system; and (c) arrangements must be made to assure a continuation of the data program to include updating and expansion of the existing information -- procedures to accomplish this are presently under study by HCRS and appropriate state agencies' staff.

(1) SCORP - Progress Report: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum entitled "SCORP - Progress Report", dated March 30, 1979, and to handouts entitled "SCORP Document Outline and Schedule of Completion". A brief explanation was made of the current drafting process for the Fifth Edition of Washington Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan (SCORP); what the document will contain, and the specific issues to be covered. On the outline Chapters I through V were sub-titled. It was pointed out that Chapter II was a summary of the issues contained in Chapter II and the needs discussed in Chapter IV. Chapter III includes discussion papers on the following subjects: Urban/Handicapped Accessibility/Special Populations/ Energy Conservation/Roles and Responsibilities/ Backcountry Recreation/ Scenic Rivers/ Wetlands and Floodplains/ Natural Heritage/ Education-Communications/ Funding Strategies/ Historical Preservation/ Off-Road Vehicles/ and Trails. Mr. Pelton noted that the initial drafting of six of the Issue Papers has been completed and these are now being reviewed by all Planning Advisory Council members - agencies and organizations, as well as several others who have requested copies. Over one hundred and fifty responses have been received and all have been supportive of the concepts in general, with some recommendations for strengthening or otherwise improving specific segments of individual papers. Eight Issue Papers remain in draft stage with completion scheduled for May and June. During late July or early August, two public hearings will be held on the total Plan (one in Eastern Washington; one in Western Washington). Final text will be prepared following those hearings, with final acceptance by the Interagency Committee and the Governor prior to forwarding to HCRS for approval in November, 1979.

Mr. Pelton also noted that in addition to SCORP an Annual Action Program is required by HCRS. Three specific addendums on Off-Road Vehicles, Natural Heritage, and State Trails will also be prepared in the next few years.

At this point, the Chairman asked Mr. Pelton to discuss:

Agenda Item IV C. Washington Statewide Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan - Schedule for Completion: Mr. Pelton reviewed the schedule as noted in memorandum of March 30, 1979, "SCORP ADOPTION":

Prepare initial text draft	June 1979	Public Hearings	August, 1979
Complete PAC review	July 1979	Revise text - final draft	September, 1979
Committee review of completed drafts	July 1979	Committee acceptance of SCORP	October, 1979
		Document to Governor	October 10, 1979
		IAC Nov. meeting	Review
		Approved by Gov/forward to HCRS	November 15, 1979
		APPROVED BY HCRS	By Dec. 15, 1979

There followed discussion on whether or not the Technical Advisory Committees (state and local) would have a chance to review the Issue Papers and other documents of SCORP. Mr. Bulley, Mr. Odegaard and other Committee members felt the TAC should have this opportunity if they so desired. Mr. Pelton pointed out the involvement

of state agencies' already on the Planning Advisory Council. At this point, Mr. Wilder read the names of the Coordinating Committee of sixteen, noting that Ken Heany, Bill Fearn and Dale Haskins present at the meeting were members. Jim Scott of the Department of Ecology represents state government on that committee, but all state agencies are represented on the Council. Mr. Pelton pointed out that the Technical Advisory Committee is a separate committee having as its primary responsibility the reviewing of grant-in-aid projects and manuals of the Projects Services Section, and that it has not been involved in the development of SCORP although some of the state agency members were on a special SCORP Task Force for previous editions. Following discussion, the Chairman appointed the following to serve on the Coordinating Committee:

Elizabeth Avery, Kirby Billingsley, Micaela Brostrom  
Representatives from each of the seven state agencies; with the understanding  
that it is the directors' prerogative whether or not they wish to have a  
representative involved.

Mr. Odegaard asked if the Committee had, at some time in the past, approved the action of the Administrator to establish a Planning Advisory Council for the express purpose of reviewing the draft of the SCORP document and assisting in its preparation. He questioned the basic responsibility of the Technical Advisory Committees (state/local). Mr. Pelton noted that the establishment of the Council had been reported to the Committee with requests for any recommendations on its functions, but no formal Committee action had been taken. Discussion followed. Mr. Larson suggested that the Committee be provided with information as to the role and responsibilities of the state TAC. It was determined that Mr. Pelton would send a letter to each of the state agencies advising them of their TAC and PAC representatives. The directors of the state agencies may then respond to the IAC Administrator as to their appointees for the Coordinating Committee. The Chairman directed Mr. Pelton to add these individuals to the Coordinating Committee and invite them to all future meetings of that body. Mr. Larson questioned the Issue Paper on Energy matters and was informed that the HCRS required that this subject be discussed in SCORP as it is a nationwide issue. Merlin Smith, of Commerce and Economic Development, TAC member, asked that a copy of that portion of the HCRS Manual relating to the requirements for a SCORP plan be sent to his director so that he might have a chance to review it. (Part 630 HCRS Manual.) Mr. Pelton pointed out that the SCORP document is required to be more than a guide to the IAC Grant-in-Aid program and has now become a matter for the Governor's issuance, and also must be approved by the Governor. IAC is the agency preparing the document, but it is more than an IAC plan as in the past.

(3) Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Study - Status: Mr. Gregory Lovelady, Planner, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, "Statewide ORV Study - Status". Mr. Lovelady stated: (1) An extension request in completing the ORV Study had been received from the principle consultant with the result that an amended Contract had been executed between the IAC and the University of California, Santa Barbara. (2) Provisions of this Contract include a final report submittal date of no later than MAY 28, 1979. Based in part on this study, a Statewide Off-Road Vehicle Plan will be drafted in accordance with the June, 1979 deadline established by the 1977 State Legislature.

Mr. Bert Cole was assured that the same type of coordination of this plan was being carried on as that for SCORP. In response to Mr. Bulley, Mr. Wilder read the names of the Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee. Mr. Cole then asked who was handling the public affairs aspect in view of the fact that ORV Projects and the program for "getting them on the ground" is a difficult one because of public opinion. It was understood that the ORVAC Committee and the IAC are cognizant of the problem and will continue working with communities and groups on management/administration, etc. matters. Mrs. Brostrom suggested that if State agencies

desire to have representation on ORVAC that they advise the Administrator.

(MR. SANDISON ARRIVED AT 10:42, and was introduced to the audience, Mr. Billingsley and Mrs. Avery.)

The Committee was advised that ORVAC is a Committee set up as mandated by the law (RCW 46.09.260).

III A. PROJECT CHANGES: Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Specialist, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, "Dept. of Game - Reinstatement of Expired Project Contract - L. T. Murray WRA - Umptanum Creek, IAC #75-613D". The Department of Game had requested that the project be retroactively reinstated due to its expiration date of August 27, 1976, and extended to December 31, 1979, to allow time for placement of a railroad flat car bridge.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. ODEGAARD THAT:

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME, L. T. MURRAY, WRA - UMPTANUM CREEK PROJECT (75-613D) EXPIRED ON AUGUST 27, 1976, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAD DETERMINED CONSTRUCTION TO BE COMPLETE IN NOVEMBER 1975, AND

WHEREAS, A CULVERT CROSSING OF UMPTANUM CREEK PREVIOUSLY INSTALLED BY A PRIVATE TIMBER COMPANY AND THOUGHT TO BE ADEQUATE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME WAS WASHED OUT BY FLOODING OF THE CREEK, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS REQUESTED THAT THE PROJECT BE REINSTATED TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE, \*AS CONTEMPLATED BY THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT AS APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DOES HEREBY RETROACTIVELY REINSTATE THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME, L. T. MURRAY WRA - UMPTANUM CREEK (75-613D) PROJECT CONTRACT TO THE ENDING DATE OF AUGUST 27, 1976, AND EXTENDS SAID CONTRACT TO DECEMBER 31, 1979, IN ORDER TO ALLOW TIME TO INSTALL A NEW BRIDGE CROSSING AND MAKE ALL FUNDS REMAINING IN THE PROJECT ELIGIBLE FOR EXPENDITURE.

\*

MOTION WAS CARRIED. (Additional wording added by Rick Finnigan, Asst. Atty. Gen.)

2. Department of Game, Sinlahekin WRA, Sheep Mt., IAC #76-609A - Project Withdrawal:

Mr. Taylor referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, "Department of Game, Sinlahekin WRA - Sheep Mt., IAC #76-609A, Project Withdrawal", noting that the Department of Game has been unsuccessful in negotiating a satisfactory settlement with the property owner.

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

WHEREAS, ON AUGUST 26, 1975, THE IAC APPROVED THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME SINLAHEKIN WRA, SHEEP MT. PROJECT (76-609A), AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME HAS BEEN UNSUCCESSFUL IN NEGOTIATING A SATISFACTORY SETTLEMENT WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE SINLAHEKIN WRA, SHEEP MOUNTAIN PROJECT (76-609A) BE WITHDRAWN AND THAT

THE ADMINISTRATOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY DOCUMENTS. THE FUNDS HEREBY DEOBLIGATED ARE RETURNED TO THE UNCOMMITTED BALANCE OF MONIES AVAILABLE TO GAME FOR FUTURE ALLOCATION TO PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. State Department of Fisheries - Master List: Mr. Glenn Moore, Chief, Projects Services, referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, entitled "State Department of Fisheries - Amendment to Master List", and stated there had been a change in the request from the Department of Fisheries. He asked that Mr. Gordon Sandison, Director, Department of Fisheries, explain the request of that department for monies to complete one of two proposed fishing piers.

Mr. Sandison stated that \$852,000 was available to the Department of Fisheries to fund two piers; however, estimates for the Seattle Pier were \$652,000 and for the Tacoma Pier \$574,000. Since neither of these projects is very far along, Mr. Sandison requested that the Committee consider granting the Department of Fisheries the flexibility of funding a fishing pier at approximately \$700,000 at either the Seattle or the Tacoma location depending upon which one is able to come on line with plans and clearances first. In response to Bert Cole's question, Rich Costello, of the Department of Fisheries, stated all permits were not yet in hand, but the Department had proceeded with preliminary design and applications have been made for the required permits. Mr. Sandison noted that it was not possible to apply for permits until the preliminary design has been completed; that the plan for the Seattle Pier is completed; the one for Tacoma will be within a week or two.

Bert Cole commented on a recent Harbor Line Commission problem in the Seattle area which had been in court and had definitely stopped all projects not related to navigation. DNR has been enjoined not to issue releases, that it would be violating the Enabling Act and Constitution of the State of Washington in issuing permits which do not deal with navigation. No matter what action IAC would take on the request of the Department of Fisheries, it was his determination that no permits would be issued until the court case is settled.

Mr. Bulley stated the question before the Committee was not regarding the availability of securing permits, but whether the Interagency Committee would authorize the building of one fishing pier project through the Department of Fisheries. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY THAT

THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AUTHORIZE AND APPROVE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES' REQUEST TO CHANGE ITS MASTER LIST TO REFLECT ITS INTENT TO CONSTRUCT A FISHING PIER IN PUGET SOUND IN THE 1977-79 BIENNIUM AT A TOTAL COST OF NOT MORE THAN \$852,000.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Bulley clarified his motion: It was responding to inflationary costs and did not relate to an authorization to change the scope of work.

III B. LEGISLATION: Mr. Wilder referred to the memorandum in the kit on Legislation (dated March 30, 1979). Correction was made concerning Substitute House Bill 236, Operating Budget to indicate \$13.5 million of the Operating Budget as committed carry-forward and ORV monies rather than \$14.6 as shown.

Mr. Odegaard asked what the policy and procedure presently is which the Committee is using as it relates to attendance at hearings and testimony on bills in which the Committee may be involved. Mrs. Brostrom stated testimony is given when requested by the Legislature, but that no Committee member nor the Administrator has taken a position on any bill other than the Operating and Capital budgets requests. The Committee has not taken any position on the reorganization bills being reviewed by the Legislature (SB 2563 - HB 257). The bond bill (SB 2357 and cf. HB 565) was an Executive Request; however, the Committee had passed several resolutions acknowledging the need for the bonds and encouraging the Governor to place this bond bill in the Legislature in order to assure matching funds for the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund monies received by the State of Washington.

Mrs. Brostrom stated she had attended several hearings and throughout all of them had given information as to the background of the IAC, how it is organized, how it is functioning, why it is needed, as well as its accomplishments. She had suggested to the legislative staff that should the composition of the Committee be changed by exclusion of the State Agencies Directors from the Interagency Committee itself that the Technical Advisory Committee be made a statutory Committee (since it is of invaluable aid to the Committee) and thus retain the input from the state agencies in the outdoor recreation field. She alluded to Senate Bill 2176 which would limit the state debt payments to seven percent of the arithmetic mean of its general state revenue (as defined) for the previous three years. This bill is presently in the House Appropriations Committee. (Amend RCW 39.42.060 [Ref: Sec. 1, Art. VIII, Const.])

Mrs. Brostrom asked the Committee members to check with Mr. Wilder on any hearings related to IAC bills.

III C. OFF-ROAD VEHICLE ENFORCEMENT AND EDUCATION: Mr. Gregory Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, "ORV Enforcement and Education Report", citing the following:

- (1) Efforts regarding issues of concern at the IAC Meeting of November 2-3, 1978 concerning ORV enforcement, education and staff coordination had been reviewed and analyzed by staff.
- (2) A special Subcommittee of the IAC was established November 1978 to assist in analyzing the short-term and long-term implications of funding problems related to ORV enforcement, education and staff coordination.
- (3) Certain ORV project sponsors have addressed the problem and advised IAC regarding the formulation of several reporting items to help coordinate education and enforcement projects.
- (4) The Assistant Attorney General had verified that "on a yearly basis no agency (i.e., the IAC) may expend ... more than fifty percent of its share of said amount (51 1/2% to IAC) for education and law enforcement programs...."
- (5) Staff reviewed enforcement and education, as well as maintenance, management and project staffing issues and proposed the following to the IAC Committee:

- a. That ORV funds coming to IAC be divided by Committee direction between Capital and Non-Capital Projects.
- b. That the Committee biannually set a distribution percentage as target figure or goal. Percentage split recommended: 50 percent or more of funds to Capital Projects; not more than 50 percent for Non-Capital Projects.
- c. All ORV projects to continue to be evaluated on project-by-project basis recipients complying with IAC requirements, including reimbursement & audits).
- d. Moratorium: Placement of a moratorium upon the funding of Education and Enforcement Projects until such time as currently funded projects in these areas could be evaluated and further criteria and need ascertained.
- e. Moratorium on additional Coordinators: Placement of a moratorium upon funding of additional ORV Coordinators until such time as currently funded projects in these areas can be evaluated and criteria and need ascertained.
- f. Demonstration Projects with specific benefits, differing from those already funded, may be considered for future funding.
- g. Projects already funded may be considered for continuation of funding if relative project value or benefits require further expenditures for adequate evaluation.
- h. Staff to work with DNR coordinating future information/education projects for which funding is requested through the IAC.

Mr. Lovelady referred to Sections 06.02 and 06.03, Maintenance/Management Policies of the ORV Guidelines; the above recommendations to be used in conjunction therewith. Staff suggested that the evaluations and recommendations be submitted by March, 1980, with staff to continue to keep the Committee informed as to the status of the evaluations. Mr. Lovelady noted that the IAC could approve the staff's proposal as a statement of IAC intent; any changes to the WACS (Washington Administrative Code) could be initiated at a later meeting.

Mr. Bulley asked for example projects of (d) and (3) above (moratorium projects). (3): Non-Capital Projects include four funded by the IAC recently -- Yakima, Chelan-Douglas Counties, Kittitas County and Spokane County - education and enforcement programs. (e): Includes an off-road vehicle coordinator - funded for the County of Spokane, who will coordinate the ORV program as it relates to nearby counties, as well as Spokane County. In response to Mr. Larson, Mr. Lovelady stated under 50% of the ORV projects fit these two categories. The State is already supporting several other ORV coordinators under a past grant program which dealt with past All-Terrain Vehicles funds.

Mr. Rick Finnigan, Assistant Attorney General, clarified for Mr. Larson that the IAC has the authority to expend funds for education and enforcement and the ORV coordinators' program. The statute indicates that education and enforcement programs may be held in non-highway areas. WACS, if requiring change, could be addressed later by the Committee at a future meeting.

Mr. Larson stated that until such time as education and enforcement programs are basically established, there will be very few off-road vehicle recreation areas developed. This moratorium could limit the expenditure of funds for projects to under fifty percent and this concerned him. Mrs. Brostrom explained that without a moratorium a disproportionate amount of funds might be spent on education/enforcement and monies would diminish for actual ORV development projects. Time limit on the moratorium was then discussed. Mr. Lovelady asked that there be opportunity for staff to evaluate the ORV Study now being carried out by Keir Nash.

Mr. Larson inquired whether it wouldn't be better to delay the WAC process until such time as the decision has been made as to a definite program for ORV's. He felt the staff should not be asked to develop a set of WACS and then have the moratorium program expire in 1980 thus making the established WACS "non-existent". Mr. Finnigan was asked whether the moratorium rule would have to be in WACS, and he responded that he had not looked into this matter, but that he tended to feel the moratorium rule would not need to be in the WACS.

At this point, IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, TO APPROVE THE MOTION AS PROPOSED BY THE IAC STAFF WITH THE ADDITION OF A SPECIFIC DATE FOR CONCLUSION OF THE MORATORIUM -- "UNTIL JANUARY 1, 1980". WITH THAT UNDERSTANDING THE FOLLOWING MOTION WAS CARRIED:

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE HAS DIRECTED STAFF TO MAKE AN ANALYSIS OF THE SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF FUNDING PROBLEMS RELATED TO ENFORCEMENT AND EDUCATION WITHIN THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE (ORV) PROGRAM;  
AND

WHEREAS, IN ORDER TO FACILITATE AND ALLOW TIME FOR SUCH AN ANALYSIS, CERTAIN PRELIMINARY MEASURES ARE DESIRABLE;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT ORV DEPOSITS IN THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT BE DIVIDED BETWEEN CAPITAL PROJECTS, WHICH WILL RECEIVE AT LEAST FIFTY (50) PERCENT OF THE FUNDS, AND NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS, WHICH WILL RECEIVE UP TO FIFTY (50) PERCENT OF THESE FUNDS; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THE ABOVE PERCENTAGE DIVISION BE EMPLOYED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS AN ADEQUATE BASIS CAN BE DEVELOPED IN SUPPORT OF A DIFFERENT PERCENTAGE DIVISION: AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT THERE BE A MORATORIUM UNTIL JANUARY 1, 1980, PLACED UPON THE FUNDING OF EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE COORDINATOR PROJECTS UNTIL SUCH TIME AS CURRENTLY FUNDED PROJECTS IN THESE AREAS CAN BE EVALUATED AND FURTHER CRITERIA AND NEED ASCERTAINED; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS WHICH PRESENT BENEFITS THAT DIFFER FROM THOSE ALREADY FUNDED ARE EXEMPTED FROM THIS MORATORIUM;  
AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT PROJECTS WHICH HAVE BEEN APPROVED FOR FUNDING MAY BE CONSIDERED FOR CONTINUED FUNDING IF RELATIVE PROJECT VALUE OR BENEFITS REQUIRE FURTHER FUNDING FOR ADEQUATE EVALUATION.

Mr. Bulley asked if the Committee needed a motion on the floor for Notice of Intent to Adopt WACS. The Assistant Attorney General stated this was an administrative matter through filing of proper forms with his office.

III D. APPRAISAL REVIEW: Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, entitled, "State Agency Project Appraisal Review Costs". Questions raised at the November 2-3 IAC meeting required answers. The Committee had asked why the staff did not include in its IAC Operating Budget request the necessary costs now being incurred as a result of the IAC requirement for the review of state agency appraisals. Mr. Moore presented staff's reasoning as follows:

1. Until 1975 all appraisals (both local and state) were required to be submitted to the IAC for review and approval.
2. Policy changed in 1975 to allow local agencies to submit appraisals directly to the review appraisers (more expedient and efficient).
3. The cost of the appraisal review was passed on to the local sponsor.
4. In formulating the Operating Budget, it was staff's opinion that involvement in the appraisal review function for state agencies projects be eliminated bascially for the same reasons as for locals.
5. Subsequently, the local and state Technical Advisory Committee in reviewing the Participation Manuals expressed a consensus that the cost of both appraisals and appraisal reviews be an eligible cost for acquisition projects. Staff adjusted the Manuals to so indicate.

Mr. Moore pointed out that the federal Land and Water Conservation Act does not allow for appraisal or appraisal review costs to be paid from LWCF monies, therefore it would be necessary for state monies alone to be used to finance these costs. Further, if a state bond issue is approved which required the proceeds be matched with LWCF, these costs could not be borne from such state funds.

Mr. Moore stated staff felt that appraisals are normally required as a part of any acquisition at the state and local level, whereas appraisal review by an IAC designated review appraier is a specific requirement of the IAC grant program.

Staff therefore recommended the cost of appraisal reviews be considered an eligible project cost for acquisition projects; whereas the cost of appraisals should remain the sole responsibility of the project sponsor. Mr. Moore noted that the eligibility of appraisal review would depend on the nature of any bond proceeds provided through the State Legislature except in those instances where Initiative 215 funds are used. By this approach, Init. 215 account should not fund non-Initiative 215 project appraisal reviews.

Mr. Moore also noted that it was staff's recommendation that the IAC would fund only one appraisal review for each parcel of land acquired. Should the cost of appraisals at some future time become an eligible cost from LWCF monies, then the cost of appraisals will be reconsidered.

Mr. Odegaard asked what the TAC had determined as eligible. Mr. Moore replied the Participation Manual #3-03.12 states that all costs be eligible - both appraisal and appraisal review. Mr. Odegaard asked if either chairman of the TAC committees had any recommendation on the matter. Mr. James Webster, Chairman of the Local Technical Advisory Committee, stated the locals had recommended that any cost required as a part of the application or process of application by the IAC be an eligible cost of the project. Mr. Odegaard asked since appraisals were required just as much as review appraisals, would not the appraisals also

be considered as eligible project cost? Mr. Webster stated appraisal costs would not be eligible because of HCRS rules in federally funded projects. Mr. Odegaard questioned why both could not be eligible costs. Mr. Moore then explained that as a part of an acquisition project administrative costs to the sponsor are not limited to only appraisal & appraisal reviews. The IAC and HCRS now only pay on the actual cost of property and the actual cost of relocation because those are the only eligible costs. All other costs are termed incidental by HCRS. The IAC has taken the appraisal review matter to the Committee as a specific request. The guideline concerning appraisals did not change. Mr. Odegaard stated he supported the opinion expressed by Mr. Webster that appraisal costs should be eligible.

Mr. Wilder explained that the cost of appraisals was actually a cost of "good business" for any particular agency and that the only additional rule of the IAC was to cover costs of the review appraisal. In the interests of fairness, however, the IAC has recommended these be covered. However, fifty percent of the available funds are federal and none of these costs are honored by the HCRS. Thus, state monies would have to pay for appraisal reviews. Should the IAC adopt a policy of paying for the appraisals, the question then is "where do you obtain the funds?" Every federal dollar is being matched with state dollars. The IAC staff did not feel it would be fair or administratively practical to take bond money away and use it to pay for appraisals.

Mr. Glenn Baker, HCRS, commented on the requirements of HCRS in regard to appraisals citing the Relocation Act of 1970, Title III, Land Acquisitions for Projects Using Federal Funds. The appraisal is not considered part of the project cost, but is an incidental cost of land acquisition. Mr. Bulley noted that staff had stated in the event cost of appraisals do become eligible costs under LWCF then the policy could be changed by the Committee. To keep state funds to a minimum, staff has asked that only appraisal review costs be eligible. He felt this was good judgment at this point in time.

The needs of the smaller communities was mentioned by Mr. Odegaard. Many are unable to absorb the cost of the appraisal, yet the IAC sets this precedent. He noted that the Initiative 215 funds are used for administrative staff of the IAC, that planning is included in IAC functions, and the IAC at some time may have to use some of its funds to assist other agencies, cities, counties, state, with their appraisals, which he felt would be the right thing to do. It was his feeling the IAC had considerable discretionary monies, and that engineering and planning costs were really no different than the cost of an appraisal. The philosophy did not appear to be consistent.

Mrs. Avery asked if many communities had indicated paying for appraisals created a hardship for them, and Mr. Wilder responded there had been no such indication from sponsors. Mr. Larson stated he agreed with Mr. Odegaard that the appraisal costs should be eligible, but since it had not been included in the budget, there was no point in discussing it further.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. BULLEY, SECONDED BY MRS. AVERY, THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ACCEPT THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION THAT APPRAISAL REVIEWS BE AN ELIGIBLE PROJECT COST, AND THAT THE COST OF APPRAISALS REMAIN THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PROJECT SPONSOR.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. A. NEWS BUSINESS. DEPT. OF GAME, L. T. MURRAY WRA - FRINGER #78-606A: Mr. Ron Taylor referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, concerning a

new Department of Game Project, L. T. Murray WRA - Fringer #78-606A. The project had received general legislative appropriation within the 1975-77 Capital Budget but was not included on the State Agency Master List approved by the IAC. The Office of Financial Management has agreed that the project is fundable from the Department of Game's reappropriated monies. The project involves the acquisition of a ten acre parcel of undeveloped land located within the proposed boundary of the L. T. Murray Wildlife Recreation Area. Acquisition will eliminate management problems should the land be acquired and developed by others.

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

WHEREAS, THE L. T. MURRAY WILDLIFE RECREATION AREA PROJECT #78-606A (FRINGER) SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME IS FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE STATEWIDE OUTDOOR RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE PLAN ADOPTED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 26, 1973; THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE DOES HEREBY APPROVE THE SUBJECT PROJECT AS BELOW NOTED AND AUTHORIZES THE ADMINISTRATOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND TO DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT WHICH HAS BEEN LISTED FOR THE PROJECT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME:

DEPARTMENT OF GAME

L. T. MURRAY WRA- FRINGER	\$5,500 REF. 28	\$5,500 TOTAL COST
------------------------------	-----------------	--------------------

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. D. IAC/FOREST SERVICE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE AGREEMENT: Mr. Wilder referred to memorandum of staff dated March 30, 1979, concerning the IAC/Forest Service Off-Road Vehicle Agreement being proposed through development of same by the IAC and the Forest Service. The intent of the document would be to incorporate the terms and conditions of each agency's participation in the provision of public recreational ORV facilities. The IAC has already approved approximately \$350,000 in ORV projects through the Forest Service, held pending the finalization of this agreement.

Mr. Lovelady then gave an oral presentation concerning the agreement covering such points as: The Off-Road Vehicle Program and "phenomena"; opportunity related to this recreational activity; the limiting statutes and attitudes prevalent, followed by staff recommendation - the considerations and approach to the problem.

1. \*ORV Phenomena: ORV recreational activity is fairly new; growth of ORV-related recreation has been phenomenal, with about 215,000 motor bikes in Washington State -- 72 percent used at some time or another off the road. Approximately 155,200 motorbikes traveling approximately 1,000 miles each off the road every year in Washington State. Further, the 4-wheel drive market has tripled since 1971. Public agencies must now cooperate and meet the challenge of providing recreational outlets for ORV recreationists.

Future of the program requires more than monetary resources; it also requires land resources. Ninety percent of the agencies applying to the IAC for ORV funds have found it impossible to conclude planning for site acquisition or development for ORV purposes. Difficulty lies in local agency acquisition of such sites. Since Forest Service has a land base already (as well as DNR), the IAC and Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC) have recognized that the Forest Service can be successful in an ORV program. Thus, the IAC/Forest Service

ORV Agreement is being proposed.

2. Mr. Lovelady noted that over 12.5 percent of the total land area of the state falls within the direct jurisdiction and control of the Forest Service. This does not include designated Forest Service wilderness or Rare II study areas. It equals almost 5.5 million acres for multiple-use.

3. Limiting Statutes, Attitudes: Mr. Lovelady noted the state and federal statutes, as well as attitudes, which severely restrict the avenues through which an agreement can be made, i.e., semantics (how funds are conveyed); project conversionary and termination provisions. Legally the Forest Service cannot accept "grants-in-aid"; state statute does not empower the IAC to make "contributions"; but through an IAC/Forest Service Agreement a mutually acceptable approach can be made.

In regard to project conversions and terminations, the Service must retain all rights and control over its land, especially in changing or terminating IAC-ORV approved projects.

4. Recommendation - Considerations: Mr. Lovelady explained staff's recommendation concerning the proposed IAC/ORV Forest Service Agreement supported by:

a. The U. S. Forest Service's past experience in management of lands and its sound judgment in such management and/or conversions;

b. The fact that the Forest Service is already involved in comprehensive ORV management programs, supported by ORV recreationists in the state, as well as local governments and ORVAC. The Service presently is involved in committing funds and manpower annually toward ORV facilities planning, development, maintenance, management, as well as information and education programs.

The IAC staff recommended the agreement be considered on a demonstration trial basis. Should it be necessary for the Service to change or convert an IAC-funded ORV project, the matter could be reviewed by the Committee at that time. The Service has stated it would make all reasonable effort to replace any ORV facility in kind.

5. Agreement: Mr. Lovelady briefly touched upon the contents of the Agreement which had been mailed to the Committee members March 16th for their review. He asked for comments and questions.

Discussion followed. In response to Mr. Bulley, Mr. Lovelady stated the Forest Service will make a serious effort to replace in kind, but that it cannot allow an outside entity to dictate to them what they will be doing with their land. Mr. Rolland Emetaz, U. S. Forest Service, stated the Service must adhere to Congressional controls, but that there would be few instances in which land would be converted, if at all, and that the Forest Service would intend to uphold its agreement with the IAC to provide the best possible areas for ORV recreationists. Mr. Bulley felt all agencies should have the same constraints in projects, and Mr. Larson questioned the fact that the IAC would be funding projects with no guarantee that they would remain open to the public.

At this point, Mr. Bert Cole reiterated the need for ORV recreational projects in the state to meet the growing demand, and stated that the Forest Service, a large land management agency is willing to assist in meeting that need.

Even though they do have constraints because of Congressional laws, they have the highest reputation in their programs. He acknowledged their requirement to have the type of language in the IAC/Forest Service ORV Agreement, and expressed his firm convictions as to their integrity. He approved of the concepts in the agreement and the action of the IAC staff in attempting to meet the needs of the state in the off-road vehicles program.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. COLE, SECONDED BY MR. BULLEY, THAT THE STAFF OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE BE AUTHORIZED TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE U. S. FOREST SERVICE AN IAC/FOREST SERVICE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE AGREEMENT AND INSURE ITS SIGNATURE THROUGH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION ACTING IN BEHALF OF THE COMMITTEE.

Mr. Bulley in seconding the motion stated it should be incumbent upon the Interagency Committee members that the staff of the IAC had thoroughly investigated into the matter to insure that there is only a slight possibility that ORV project facilities would be closed down within a short time once they were funded. Mr. Odegaard agreed with Mr. Cole, mentioning the fact that the Parks and Recreation Commission has worked with the Forest Service for many years and has found them to be very cooperative. He asked whether it would be possible to look into the federal law regarding special use permits and management agreements instead of negotiating the agreement under discussion. He suggested the MATTER BE SET ASIDE UNTIL IAC STAFF COULD INVESTIGATE THE FEDERAL LAW REGARDING SPECIAL USE PERMITS AND MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.

Mr. Emetaz explained this had already been explored and it had been determined the use permit "route" would be fairly cumbersome. There would need to be a special use permit for each and every project. He stated the Forest Service nationwide has become involved in ORV planning with public involvement, EIS factors, etc. The State of Washington now has the opportunity to become a part of that nationwide program. Though Mrs. Brostrom approved of the idea of looking into the use permit possibility, she stated she did not want to hold up the Agreement document. Mr. Larson asked why it was necessary to take action on the Agreement now. Mr. Wilder noted the seven projects the IAC had approved for off-road vehicle recreationists' use, and the need to have the Agreement in hand to proceed with the projects. Mr. Odegaard stated perhaps there should be more study and MOVED TO TABLE THE MOTION; SECONDED BY MR. LARSON.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE MOTION TO TABLE. FOUR OPPOSED; TWO VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE (MR. ODEGAARD AND MR. LARSON). THE MOTION TO TABLE WAS DEFEATED.

QUESTION THEN CALLED FOR ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION. FOUR VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE: TWO IN THE NEGATIVE (MR. ODEGAARD AND MR. LARSON). THE ORIGINAL MOTION CITED IN PARAGRAPH TWO ABOVE WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Odegaard then asked that the Assistant Attorney General be requested to investigate the legal aspects of the Committee's action. IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ODEGAARD, SECONDED BY MR. LARSON, THAT THE OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL REVIEW THE IAC/FOREST SERVICE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE AGREEMENT TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE TO ENTER INTO SUCH AN AGREEMENT IS LEGAL; FURTHER, IF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL INDICATE SUCH ACTION IS NOT LEGAL, THAT THE IAC/FOREST SERVICE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE AGREEMENT BE DECLARED NULL AND VOID.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

Mr. Bulley requested the opinion from the Assistant Attorney General be expedited and that copies be sent to Committee members. He asked if there had been a legal review of the provisions in the agreement prior to its being brought to the Committee. Mr. Finnigan replied he had reviewed the Agreement as to form, but had not perused it for content. He mentioned that regardless of provisions of this Agreement, the Committee makes the final decision on all projects on a project-by-project basis. This fact is in the proposed Agreement.

Mr. Odegaard expressed his appreciation for Mr. Lovelady's report stating it was one of the finest presentations he had ever heard and that he was glad to have had this type of graphic, factual report.

IAC MEETINGS SCHEDULE: There followed discussion on the need for a meeting in July or August to review the Washington Administrative Code changes brought about by certain changes in the procedural guidelines of the agency in relation to projects, and meetings held with the Assistant Attorney General as to those rules/regulations of the agency which must be included in the WACS. Other agenda items will include: Local Action Program; SCORP progress; Off-Road Vehicle Study, etc. Mr. Odegaard suggested the Chairman and Administrator select a date for the July or August meeting and advise the Committee members later.

---

AFTERNOON SESSION

MARCH 30, 1979

The IAC reconvened at 2:24 following luncheon. Though there was not a quorum\*, the Chairman declared the meeting open for discussion purposes of the IAC.

\*(BROSTROM, BILLINGSLEY, AVERY, ODEGAARD.)

IV. B. PARTICIPATION MANUALS #1 THROUGH #9.

Mr. Wilder gave a short explanation of the need to refine the former IAC Procedural Guideline manual of 1973 into the nine Participation Manuals, followed by Mr. Moore's presentation.

Mr. Moore referred to memorandum of staff dated March 13, 1979, "Procedural Guidelines - Participation Manuals", stating the basic intents of the refinements were as follows:

1. To eliminate confusion within the existing guidelines;
2. To separate acquisition and development into separate sections for ease of understanding by sponsors;
3. To help make administration of the IAC procedures and policies more efficient;
4. To incorporate new federal regulations emanating from the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service (HCRS);
5. To provide sponsors only pertinent information related to their immediate interests; and
6. To avoid a separate set of regulations for State Agency participants (although some modifications are included in Manual #9)

Mr. Moore pointed out there had been no attempt to add new requirements other than those now being applied as a result of federal requirements. The few revisions were a result of agency staff and TAC input, briefly as follows:

1. The maximum eligible IAC funding remains at up to 75% and extended to all projects regardless of Area Type.
2. Conversion policies were developed based upon current HCRS policy regarding conversion of acquisitions. The development conversion is new.
3. Signing policy has been defined; reference to small metal signs has been dropped.
4. Federal requirements have been added as information to sponsors (not now included in current guidelines).
5. Deviations, state agencies' projects, will be handled on case-by-case basis; Master List approval procedure now eliminates TAC review; State Application removes local health review (done through A-95) and deletes EIS when only state monies are used. Application now asks that state agencies go through the office of Archaeological and Historic Preservation.
6. In Manual #3, interim non-recreation use policy (03.27) and user fees policy (03.30) are both from HCRS.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #1 - GENERAL INFORMATION ON HOW TO OBTAIN GRANT-IN-AID FUNDING FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION PROJECTS

There were no comments from the Committee concerning this Manual.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #2 - INFORMATION ON MEETING PLANNING ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Pelton reported no change in the planning eligibility requirements, but certain aspects have been clarified and/or modified. Two changes were made from existing policy:

1. In relation to the six-year capital improvement program, a simplified form has been included in the Manual. The six-year CIP will be required, but need not be identified by individual years.
2. Inventory requirement: The elimination of a detailed inventory from the body of the Plan and replacement of this requirement with participation in the Public Lands Inventory Program on forms furnished by the IAC.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3 - ACQUISITION PROJECT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Mr. Moore referred to the following:

- 3.07 - Second paragraph, "Sponsor's governing authority must provide adequate assurance that the required local share is available at least thirty days prior to the IAC funding meeting."
- 3.09 - Eligible Acquisition Projects - items (1) and (4) were discussed by TAC and staff. It was suggested that the 50-year minimum lease be changed to allow flexibility related to the proposed nature of the development. Staff feels 50-year minimum requirement is a sound one. (4) has been changed to indicate that the cost of the lease must be in a lump sum payment at initiation.

- 03.12 Eligible and Ineligible Acquisition Costs: Paragraph (3), Committee has approved during the morning's session, and the words "appraisal and" will be deleted to indicate only review appraisal may be an eligible cost.
- 03.13 Waiver of Retroactivity: A statement has been added providing that acquisitions, covered by a waiver, are eligible for consideration at two consecutive funding sessions.
- 03.28B Formal Appraisal Requirements: No changes will be made in content; merely wording. The intent will remain the same.
- 03.29 Revenue Feasibility Studies: Review committee felt cost of study should be eligible; staff's position is that such costs should be paid by the sponsor.

Mr. Odegaard referred to: 03.26 and asked that wording be changed to indicate the following:

- 03.26 "Nonrecreation uses, such as timber management, grazing, and other natural resources uses may be carried out on lands acquired with IAC assistance if they are clearly compatible with ~~the~~ the and secondary to recreation use, and are approved prior to initiation."

03.31 and 03.32 NONRECREATIONAL INCOME DERIVED DURING THE PROJECT CONTRACT PERIOD and NONRECREATIONAL INCOME DERIVED AFTER THE PROJECT CONTRACT PERIOD, respectively:

Mr. Odegaard expressed his concern in these guidelines that "gross nonrecreational income accruing to an IAC-assisted area during the project period would be used to reduce the total cost of the project," and "the gross nonrecreational income accruing subsequent to the project ending dated.....must be used only to offset expenses of operation and maintenance of the facility funded or for park and recreation capital acquisition and development unless precluded by state law...." Mr. Kenn Cole clarified these guidelines stating the gross income referred to was that which accrued to the agency. Mr. Bill Fearn, Director, Parks and Recreation City of Spokane, commented on the Highbridge Project, City of Spokane. A trailer lot site had caused the Highbridge Project total cost to be reduced by the dollars emanating from the trailer lot facility. Mr. Moore replied the income derived from the trailer lot was "non-recreational" income and could not therefore be a part of the project since HCRS funds had been used to fund the project.

Mr. Moore stated the HCRS Manual, Part 675.1, called for these two guidelines. It was suggested by Mr. Odegaard that wording be added to 03.32, "except where precluded by a superceding law". At this point, Mrs. Brostrom asked that the Administrator pursue the question with HCRS and obtain clarification as to their regulations. Mr. Glenn Baker, from HCRS, explained that when property is purchased with LWCF monies, it must become a park for the people. If there is income included, then the general philosophy is that the project total cost be reduced accordingly in order to "stretch" LWCF funds as far as possible. He stated he would be pleased to pursue the clarification of the matter with HCRS if so requested.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #4 - DEVELOPMENT PROJECT POLICIES AND PROCEDURE:

Mr. Moore referred to Participation Manual #4:

- 04.07. Participant's matching share must be available (minimum 25% of the total cost; 30 days' notice of assurance; etc.)

- 04.08 (14) Reflects that covered pools not yet eligible; awaiting HCRS new proposed policy.
- 04.09 Park/School Projects: Modified to delete many stringent requirements placed upon these projects; projects must be basically recreational in nature, etc.
- 04.11 Seattle had asked that cost of EIS be eligible; King County requested that costs of assessments be eligible. Staff did not concur; also HCRS will not reimburse on assessments.
- 04.12 Staff will make necessary adjustments so that certain preliminary costs will be eligible.

Following Mr. Moore's review, Mr. Odegaard corrected 04.01, deleting the word "acquire" since the Chapter relates to development policies.

- 04.11 Mr. Odegaard clarified that boundary surveys costs are not eligible on development projects but are for acquisition projects.
- 04.20 and 04.21 Mr. Odegaard asked that these also be included in the questions being posed to HCRS on nonrecreational income derived during the project contract period and after the project contract period...the same questions as being posed for 03.31 and 03.32.

Mr. Bill Fearn asked that the staff consider assessments costs as eligible on projects, giving his reasoning. Mr. Jim Webster, Director, Parks and Recreation, King County, also requested assessment costs be eligible. Following discussion, Mr. Moore noted that assessment rates vary considerably and it is up to the local entities - local tax authorities - to set the rates and sponsors must adhere to their policies. Mrs. Brostrom asked that the Technical Advisory Committee review this guideline and that it be brought back again to the Committee.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #5 - APPLICATION POLICY AND PROCEDURE:

Mr. Moore reported no changes in the current system regarding application policy and procedure. The application form has been modified to include HCRS data and eliminate non-essential items. Two applications now appear in this portion of the Manuals: One for development and one for acquisition.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #6 - PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM:

Mr. Moore reported no changes in the Evaluation System. In response to Mr. Odegaard's question, both he and Mrs. Brostrom gave assurance that within the point system there were provisions for consideration of facilities for the handicapped and various other requirements now being considered in the Issue Papers for SCORP.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7 - APPROVED PROJECT ADMINISTRATION:

Mr. Moore referred to 07.17 - Conversion Policy to meet HCRS requirements when federal monies are within a project. Procedure for converting a development project (07.17B) has been added.

Within the Project Contract, Mr. Moore stated the Department of Fisheries had

objected to Paragraph 12. Project Termination...."this Contract may be suspended or canceled, at the option of the IAC.....(a) Contracting Party...failed to make satisfactory progress or complete the project...; (b) Contracting Party is failing to make satisfactory progress to complete any other project....etc." This is, however, an existing requirement and has been for many years.

Mr. Moore also noted that the HCRS Chapter 660.4 "Project Agreement General Provisions" had been made a part of the Manual.

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #8 - REIMBURSEMENT PROCEDURE AND POLICY:

Mr. Moore stated there were no major changes; had been rewritten to make them more clearly understood. Form A19 - Invoice Voucher - is a new form (noted as Attachment 8A in Manual #8.)

PARTICIPATION MANUAL #9 - SPECIAL POLICY AND PROCEDURES APPLICABLE ONLY TO STATE AGENCIES:

Mr. Moore stated the major modifications identified the current capital budget process and simplification of same. TAC review of state agencies' master list has been deleted; such review no longer necessary. The application has been modified to reflect simplified process.

Mr. Odegaard expressed his appreciation for staff's recognition of state agencies' workload in the preparation of applications and thanked them for the simplified approach as outlined in the Manual. He referred to:

09.04B "The IAC shall adopt a Master List at the first meeting following passage of the Capital Appropriations Act".

He suggested that there was no need for this action, that the IAC staff could immediately set up the Master Lists according to the legislatively passed Capital Budget since it would be an "automatic" MasterList. He suggested the wording be changed in this guideline similar to, "The IAC Master List shall be construed to have been adopted by the Interagency Committee members when the State Capital Budget is passed by the Washington State Legislature." He made it clear that he was not discussing "group categories" which the Legislature might include in the Capital Budget, but those line-itemmed projects which the Interagency Committee had already reviewed through its own Capital Budgeting process and had forwarded on for Governor and Legislature approval. Mr. Moore stated it would still be necessary for the IAC at the next meeting to approve the Master Lists for state agencies until the policy could be changed. Mrs. Brostrom suggested that the Administrator work with the Assistant Attorney General on authority to approve the Master Lists to insure that the IAC would be acting in accordance with the law. She asked that this proposal be brought back to the Committee at its next meeting.

Federal/State application: Mr. Odegaard noted staff stresses "HCRS funding" when in actuality there may well be other federal funds available for park and recreation acquisition/development use. He suggested there be an over-riding Chapter of the Manuals which could deal with "other federal funds; other federal rules and regulations", spelling out the same type of authority and necessary preparations as for HCRS applications. Mrs. Brostrom asked the Administrator to look into this matter, perhaps incorporating it within the present manual system.

TAC: In response to request of Mrs. Mylroie, the Chairman asked the Administrator

to review the former system and determine when the state agencies TAC members might have the opportunity to review the Master Lists.

Mr. Odegaard reiterated the need to have before the Committee at its next meeting duties, responsibilities, role, purpose of the Technical Advisory Committees (State and Local). He asked that a report be given by each of the TAC Committee Chairman.

THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:13 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE

*8-10-1979 as amended*

(DATE)

*Micaela Brostrom*

MICAELA BROSTROM, CHAIRMAN