

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

REGULAR MEETING

DATE: November 7, 1985 PLACE: Coho Annex, Tye Motor Inn
500 Tye Drive
Tumwater, Washington 98502

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS OR DESIGNEES/STATE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Anne Cox, Spokane, Chair
Jeanie Marsden, Vancouver
Joe C. Jones, Seattle
Ralph Mackey, Everett
Virginia Warden, Spokane

Cleve Pinnix, Designee, Honorable Brian Boyle, Natl. Resources
George Volker, Designee, Jack Wayland, Director, Dept. Game
Gary Alexander, Designee, Bill Wilkerson, Director, Fisheries
Jan Tveten, Director, Parks and Recreation Commission

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - INTRODUCTIONS: The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Anne Cox, Chair, with a quorum present. (Nine: COX, MARSDEN, JONES, MACKAY, WARDEN, TVETEN, PINNIX, VOLKER, ALEXANDER.)

The attendees were welcomed by the Chair and asked to introduce themselves. Some represented advisory committee membership to the IAC - Off-Road Vehicles, State Trails, Technical, and Planning. Jerry Pelton, Chief, Planning Services, was asked to introduce a new staff member of IAC, Lorraine Flemm, Recreation Resource Planner.

Mr. Byron Haley, Executive Director, Washington Recreation and Park Association and the Washington Park Foundation, was called upon to briefly discuss proposed legislation of the WRPA and Initiative 90, a Wildlife Referendum proposed by the Citizens for Wildlife, Seattle.

(1) Bond Issue Proposal, WRPA: Would authorize the State Finance Committee to issue, prior to June 30, 2000, General Obligation Bonds in the amount of \$230 million; funds to be deposited in the Outdoor Recreation Account (ORA) for state/local programs served by the IAC (acquisition, development, redevelopment, renovation of outdoor recreation areas and facilities).

(2) Property Tax Levies: 10 year Serial Levy designed to generate approximately \$230 million over a ten-year period. Another would be a permanent levy to provide approximately \$230 million over twenty year period. Money to be deposited in ORA for similar use as noted in (1) above.

(3) 1-90, Wildlife Referendum: Increase state sales tax by 1/8 of 1% (25¢ on a \$200 purchase), generating approximately \$38 million per year. Two-thirds deposited in State Game Fund; ~~1/2~~ in wildlife account to be administered by IAC to fund wildlife recreation projects and programs (state and local projects).

Mr. Haley urged the members and those attending the meeting to sign the Initiative 1-90 petition to help provide a secure future for Washington's wildlife heritage.

American Park and Recreation Society (APRS) Distinguished Fellow Award: On behalf of the Committee, Ms. Cox congratulated Bob Wilder, Director, IAC, on receiving the American Park and Recreation Society's Distinguished Fellow Award at its Annual Session, Dallas, Texas. This is the highest award which can be received from APRS for a park and recreation professional member.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - JULY 25, 1985: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MRS. WARDEN, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 25, 1985, IAC MEETING BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS TO THE AGENDA - NOVEMBER 7, 1985: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. VOLKER, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, THAT THE AGENDA OF THE NOVEMBER 7, 1985, IAC MEETING BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONS AS PROPOSED BY MR. WILDER:

III. A. 1. b. Dept. of Game, Wenatchee River, IAC #74-621A - Land Exchange.

III. A. 3. King County, Lake Wilderness Trail, IAC #80-052A - Waive Requirements of Participation Manual #7, 07.19A, Acquisitions Projects Converted. MOTION WAS CARRIED.

II. STATUS REPORTS. A. DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Mr. Wilder introduced Mr. John Brentlinger, Assistant Chief of Youth Programs, Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission.

Mr. Brentlinger reported on the Youth Conservation Corps program of the State Parks and Recreation Commission, noting that the program was one of the oldest youth employment programs in the state having been enacted twenty-four years ago by the State Legislature (RCW 43.51.500). The intent of the program is to obtain work experience and job training for youngsters fourteen through twenty-one. The law enables the Youth Development and Conservation Corps (YDCC) to work on privately owned or publicly owned recreation lands that are available free of charge to the public; to accept gifts, grants or contributions and to enter into contracts to enhance youth employment. Examples were given of completed projects. Mr. Brentlinger pointed out that the program does not exist to make a profit. State Parks simply pays the wages and charges to the account necessary key equipment and replacement of same. Youngsters participating in the program are later able to use their certificates of dedicated service as evidence of job training in that particular field.

A slide presentation concerning the YDCC program was given showing the various types of work performed by the groups, their residential and non-residential type programs, and the supervision. Typical work projects throughout the state have included: landscaping, tree planting and trimming, trail building, camp and picnic area construction, fire road building and clearing, bridge construction litter pick-up, park maintenance, building construction/maintenance, waste disposal facility construction, picnic table assembly, slash removal and burning, irrigation system installation, and sign installation.

Mr. Brentlinger stressed that the service of the youth corps is available to all who request it and will give in return a cost-effective work program. At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Tveten noted that 12,000 youngsters have gone through the program in the last twenty years.

Director's Report - continued: Mr. Wilder reported this was the first meeting where designees were able to represent agency directors on the Committee. Those attending were: George Volker, Department of Game; Gary Alexander, Department of Fisheries; and Cleve Pinnix, Department of Natural Resources.

Bond Funds: Barbara Phillips, Assistant Attorney General, was asked for an updated report on the current situation regarding Chapter 4, Laws of 1985 (House Bill #1328), General Obligation Bonds.

She noted the following:

(1) Chapter 4 had authorized the State Finance Committee to issue General Obligation Bonds of the State of Washington in the amount of \$285,851,000, "or so much thereof as may be required, to finance the projects authorized" in the act.

(2) The Bond Counsel (composed of attorneys from five major law firms in Washington State) reviewed the law as passed by the Legislature and decided they were unwilling or unable to unqualifiedly approve the bond bill. They determined the bill might be defective in that it covered more than one subject and did not specifically point out that the bonds were all authorized. Therefore, they felt the bonds would not be marketable as there was no guarantee they would be constitutional.

(3) In the State of Washington, the Supreme Court does not issue final opinions, therefore it was necessary to bring the matter to the Supreme Court in the form of a law suit. This was argued on October 15, 1985.

(4) A decision was to have been announced November 7th. However, as of time of the IAC meeting none was available. Depending on that decision it may be necessary to return the matter to the Washington State Legislature for resolution.

Mr. Wilder acknowledged the IAC staff was aware of this matter and that approved funding for those projects having bond funds in them would be approved by the Committee "contingent upon the sale of the bonds". Section (4) of the law (Chapter 4, 1985) reads, "General Obligation Bonds of the State of Washington in the sum of three million two hundred thirty thousand dollars, or so much thereof as may be required shall be issued.....and shall be deposited in the outdoor recreation account."

Off-Road Vehicle Program: Mr. Wilder noted the several developments occurring in the Off-Road Vehicle Program to be discussed at a later time during the meeting.

Legislation: Six or seven pieces of legislation which would be of some assistance to the IAC were mentioned by Mr. Wilder. In addition to those mentioned by Mr. Haley, these included: Modification of the existing off-road vehicle legislation, small school/community assistance program, and urban parks (lottery for recreation).

A change in the proposal for urban parks was outlined -- instead of a certain percentage of the lottery for this purpose, there may be one lottery game per year set aside for parks and recreation purposes. The monies would flow through the Outdoor Recreation Account for legislative and IAC Committee decision-making.

Conflict Resolutions: Over the years with reduced fiscal resources, changing priorities, competing uses and growing demands, the management and protection of resources is far more demanding. Closure of facilities, changing uses, proposed conversions and general neglect are placing significant demands upon the staff and the Interagency Committee. Situations such as these will be brought before the IAC members for resolution from time to time.

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Program: Mr. Wilder and Mr. Pinnix reported the Aquatic Lands project review and evaluation had been completed. A listing of projects with specific funding will be reviewed by Commissioner Bryan Boyle (Department of Natural Resources) and monies will be allocated very soon. Mr. Wilder emphasized the interdepartmental cooperation (IAC-DNR) to bring this program to fruition.

Director's Report - continued:

Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund: An update on the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Program was given by Mr. Wilder:

- (1) \$50 million figure for state and local government LWCF is still holding firm. Estimate apportionment to the State of Washington will be \$800,000, to be divided equally between state and local agencies.
- (2) The apportionment is approximately two-thirds of that received in FY 1985.

Wendy Brand, Chief, Recreation Assistance Branch, National Park Service, was asked by Mr. Wilder to read a letter from NPS reapportioning \$161,622.18 LWCF to the State of Washington. This money was previously deobligated after the expiration of the period of availability of previous apportionments. The State of Washington has demonstrated its ability to expend these funds on needed outdoor recreation projects and the monies have thus been returned to the Outdoor Recreation Account (ORA).

In response to Mr. Tveten's question, Mr. Wilder stated the IAC had estimated receipt of \$2.3 million in the 1985-87 budgets. Mr. Tveten stated this means the projects funding programs will have to be cut substantially, at least for the first year.

National Commission (President's Commission on Americans Outdoors): Mr. Wilder reported the President's Commission has had its first meeting and are now conducting Commission and sub-committee hearings. The Commission will examine existing outdoor recreation lands and resources and the land and resource base necessary for future outdoor recreation; the roles of the Federal, State, county and municipal governments and the private sector in meeting present and future outdoor recreation needs. Mr. Wilder stated there is an excellent nationwide system of parks and recreation, but what happens at the Federal level will affect state and local levels, and there is a need to continue providing testimony and information to this Commission. Wilbur F. LaPage, Director, Division of Parks and Recreation, State of New Hampshire, was in charge of the Dallas, Texas hearings.

Initiative 215 Survey: Mr. Stanley Scott, Chief, Management Services, reviewed the results of the Initiative 215 Survey recently conducted by the Department of Licensing (Survey Report to be issued soon). In order to determine the proportion of motor vehicle fuel tax which is tax on marine fuel, the Fuel Tax Section of the Department of Licensing conducts a survey "at least once every four years" in accordance with the law (RCW 43.99.040). The last survey was conducted four years ago and resulted in a percentage of .80.

(2) The 1985 survey consisted of postcards sent to 17,000 gasoline powered boat owners; 350 were returned as undeliverable, and of the remaining 16,650 cards, 9,804 were completed and returned to the Department of Licensing....58.88%. The percentage for the 1985 survey was .779.

(3) The survey is subject to a public hearing. If the results of the public hearing determine that there is some defect or that the survey did not actually measure the amount of gas being used by gasoline powered boat owners, then these results might change.

(4) Should the .779 percentage stand, it will be necessary for adjustments to be made to the Initiative 215 estimated receipts for a six-month period -- approximately \$6,000 per month will need to be returned to the Dept. of Licensing. The IAC Operating Budget provided for this type of contingency and it will be possible to overcome this difference. The difference can be accommodated without any significant impact on state or local agencies.

Discussion followed. Mr. Scott replied to questions as follows:

(1) The survey was based on the Department of Licensing records for registered boat owners. Approximately 10% of these boat owners were sent the postcard survey form.

(2) People may not be accurate in their recall of how much gasoline they purchased for a given period of time, and there are probably numerous errors made, both high and low.

(3) The survey document itself has not yet been released. A Marine Fuel Use Study memoranda dated November 4, 1985, has been received by the agency and was referred to for this particular report.

(4) Boat owners need not register certain boats under 16' in length; there may also be other small vessels not required to register. All of these boat owners did not take part in the survey.

(5) It was determined by the Department of Licensing that the survey would be better performed through random selection rather than sending to all registered boaters. They felt they would be able to get a statistically valid sampling in this manner.

(6) The economy during the time of the survey was not taken into account and has not been in the past.

(7) The trend has been downward. Prior to the previous survey, the percentage was .93. This lowered to .80 and now is .779.

Mr. Tveten offered his agency's assistance through use of a report prepared by the State Parks and Recreation Commission some time ago. The agency surveyed how many small and large boats came to marine state parks -- and obtained information as to the different length categories. He suggested this might be of some assistance in trying to determine where these users who had reported were represented on the scale. Mrs. Warden felt the survey should be done again.

RESOLUTION - LORETTA SLATER: Mr. Ralph Mackey read a proposed resolution to the Committee AND MOVED THAT IT BE ACCEPTED. MRS. WARDEN SECONDED.

WHEREAS, THE MEMBERS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DESIRE TO RECORD THEIR DEEP SORROW AT THE DEATH OF A MOST DEDICATED VOLUNTEER - LORETTA SLATER - WHO SERVED ON THE STATE TRAILS ADVISORY COMMITTEE SINCE ITS INCEPTION, AND AS CHAIRMAN FOR MUCH OF THAT TIME, AND WHO PARTICIPATED ON MANY OTHER COMMITTEES, AND IN ORGANIZATIONS DEVOTED TO PROMOTION OF BICYCLE, HIKING, AND WATER TRAILS THROUGHOUT THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE MEMBERS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION DO HEREBY GIVE FORMAL EXPRESSION OF THEIR SYMPATHY IN THE DEATH OF LORETTA SLATER, AND DO HEREBY NOTE IN THE OFFICIAL RECORDS THE PASSING FROM THIS LIFE OF A WOMAN ESTEEMED BY HER ASSOCIATES, LOVED BY HER FRIENDS, AND RESPECTED BY ALL,

RESOLVED, FURTHER, THAT A COPY OF THIS RESOLUTION BE TENDERED TO MEMBERS OF THE SLATER FAMILY AS AN EXPRESSION OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS' HEARTFELT SYMPATHY IN THEIR BEREAVEMENT.

RESOLUTION WAS PASSED.

II. B. FISCAL STATUS REPORTS: (1) Mr. Scott referred to a new Fiscal Status Report distributed at the meeting dated November 1, 1985, replacing the summary in the kits dated October 29, 1985. This summary presented to the Committee the

most up-to-date information available on cumulative available, pending, and approved monies in LWCF, Referendum 28, Initiative 215, and HJR 52 bonds. It provided the Committee with a statement of the overall cash position. For the benefit of new Committee members, Mr. Scott briefly explained the various columns and noted that the additional \$161,662.18 of LWCF monies reported to the Committee by Ms. Brand of NPS was also included. All funds were divided equally between state and local agencies. The \$800,000 to be received from the National Park Service (NPS) was not included because it represents anticipated monies and is not cash available.

Mr. Wilder informed the Committee that the \$161,000 plus received from NPS was the result of the diligent work of the IAC staff, timely billings to the National Park Service, transfer of funds to projects, and projects which had closed short. Over 1,730 projects have been funded by the IAC since 1965. Savings have occurred in some of these projects. This has helped other projects with their funding.

Mr. Pinnix asked how long a project remained in the pending column. Mr. Scott explained the time varies, but in general after the Committee takes action - approval of projects - the funds then are shown in the approved column as contracts are completed. Mr. Scott also informed Mr. Pinnix that the \$320,528 indicated as the total in the Local Agencies' Pending column represents approvals of projects that already exist and are currently remaining from the grants to local agencies projects made last year. Mrs. Warden thanked the staff for their efforts and dedication in saving monies for other projects to share.

Introduction: Ms. Cox introduced Joe C. Jones, new member of the Interagency Committee.

Following a break, the IAC meeting was reconvened at 10:13 a.m.

IV. NEW BUSINESS - B. LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS: Ms. Cox reminded those attending the meeting to complete a Participant Registration Card if they wished to speak to their project or any other agenda item.

Mr. James Webster, Chief, Project Services, referred to memorandum of staff, "Local Agencies' Project Funding", dated November 7, 1985. Letters in regard to a certain project were distributed to each Committee member later in the meeting for review (support of Kitsap County, Island Lake Project, IAC #86-013D). (APPENDIX "A" to these minutes.)

Mr. Webster cited the following:

(1) Thirty-six projects were being recommended for funding consideration as noted in Table I. Deleted were: Vashon Park District, Vashon Pool Renovation, IAC #86-019D due to failure of a bond issue to pass in the Vashon area; and City of Auburn, Game Farm Park, IAC #86-028D, for the same reason.

(2) Table I represented the ranking of each project application as determined by the Evaluation Team during its evaluation session held on October 21-25, 1985.

(3) Initiative 215 funds (unreclaimed marine fuel tax) can only be used for transient recreational boating related projects.

(4) Staff suggested to sponsors funding levels of 50 percent IAC, and 50 percent local participation, with a \$150,000 ceiling as a maximum amount of matching funds any one sponsor might expect to receive.

Each project was then presented to the Committee utilizing slides and verbal summaries.

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
 Projects Requesting Funding in November, 1985
 Table Number 1

Project Name	Reg	Sponsor Name	Score	LWCF	Bonds	I 215	IAC Total	Sponsor Share	Project Total	% Res
1 Pool Renovation	13	Pomeroy	141.8	75,000	75,000	0	150,000	199,980	349,980	43
2 Clear Lake Park Renovation	3	Skagit County Parks & Rec	132.6	142,100	0	0	142,100	142,100	284,200	50
3 Guest Moorage Float Replacement	3	Skagit County, Port of	131.0	0	0	103,000	103,000	103,000	206,000	50
4 Meadowdale Playfields	4	Lynnwood, City of	125.2	150,000	0	0	150,000	240,000	390,000	38
5 Burnt Bridge Creek Acquisition	6	Vancouver, City of	123.7	0	150,000	0	150,000	160,320	310,320	48
6 Saxe Farm Park	4	Auburn, City of	120.1	0	150,000	0	150,000	2,598,700	2,748,700	5
7 Lawson Park Development	12	Pullman Parks & Rec.	120.0	0	150,000	0	150,000	320,800	470,800	32
8 Burke/Sil-Sammish R Trail Link	4	King County Parks & Rec.	119.4	0	77,500	0	77,500	77,500	155,000	50
9 Vance Creek County Park	2	Grays Harbor County	118.1	150,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
10 Day Use Park Acquisition	5	Lewis County Parks & Rec.	117.8	0	32,150	0	32,150	32,150	64,300	50
11 Newcastle Beach Park Dev.	4	Bellevue Parks & Rec.	117.1	0	150,000	0	150,000	1,477,430	1,627,430	5
12 Swimming Pool Renovation	10	Kennecook, City of	115.8	0	150,000	0	150,000	700,000	850,000	18
13 South Lake Union Park	4	Seattle, City of	114.5	132,891	0	0	132,891	132,891	265,782	50
14 Leslie Groves Park, Phase 4	10	Richland, City of	114.2	0	150,000	0	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
15 Vashon Pool Renovation	4	Vashon Park District	110.8	0	150,000	0	150,000	691,000	841,000	18
16 First Street Dock Enhancement	4	Brewerton, Port of	110.1	0	0	74,177	74,177	74,177	148,354	50
17 Spray Pool	8	Harrah, Town of	109.8	0	10,399	0	10,399	10,399	20,798	50
18 Cummings Boat Property, Ph. 2	4	Tacoma MPD	109.7	150,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
19 Alder Lake Rec. Area, Phase 3	4	Tacoma PUD	109.5	150,000	0	0	150,000	842,766	992,766	15
20 Two Rivers Boat Launch Facility	10	Benton County Parks & Rec	108.0	0	0	82,617	82,617	82,618	165,235	50
21 Pt. Defiance Transient Moorage	4	Tacoma MPD	107.9	0	0	150,000	150,000	150,000	300,000	50
22 Sarg Hubbard Park, Phase II	8	Yakima, County of	106.3	0	150,000	0	150,000	152,125	302,125	41
Island Lake County Park	4	Kitsap County Parks	105.1	150,000	0	0	150,000	156,200	306,200	41
24 Boat Launch Improvement	6	Kalama, Port of	103.6	0	0	83,075	83,075	84,075	167,150	50
25 City Beach Park, Phase II	3	Oak Harbor, City of	103.5	0	59,715	0	59,715	59,716	119,431	50
26 County Rec. Fac.-Prairie Elem.	5	Yale School District	99.4	0	150,000	0	150,000	192,500	342,500	41
27 Restroom Facilities/View Deck	3	Friday Harbor, Port of	98.8	0	0	72,202	72,202	72,203	144,405	50
28 Vantage Boat Ramp	8	Kittitas Co./Grant Co. PUD	97.6	0	0	30,000	30,000	30,000	60,000	50
29 Kasch Park Soccer Fields	4	Everett, City of	95.8	149,288	0	0	149,288	149,289	298,577	50
30 Riverfront Park (Passive)	6	Longview, Port of	94.7	0	103,446	0	103,446	103,447	206,893	50
31 Moxee Park, Phase II	8	Moxee, City of	89.7	0	32,992	0	32,992	32,992	65,984	50
32 Pickett Property Acquisition	4	Monroe, City of	88.7	0	53,000	0	53,000	53,000	106,000	50
33 Marina Observation Deck	4	Port Orchard, City of	84.7	0	11,650	0	11,650	11,650	23,300	50
34 Kitsap Lk Launch Ramp-Trip Pkg	4	Brewerton, City of	83.6	0	0	50,000	50,000	50,000	100,000	50
35 Waterway Trail Improvements	2	Ocean Shores, City of	82.8	0	0	18,810	18,810	18,810	37,620	50
36 Sport Court	2	Westport, City of	81.7	0	3,550	0	3,550	3,550	7,100	50
37 Lions Club Park Acquisition	6	Kalama, City of	81.3	0	19,750	0	19,750	19,750	39,500	50
38 Suquamish Boat Landing	4	Suquamish Tribe	70.5	0	0	23,200	23,200	23,200	46,400	50
TOTAL				1,249,279	1,829,152	687,091	3,765,512	9,698,338	13,463,850	

by the Project Services staff.

Those projects receiving comments or questions from Committee members while being reviewed were as follows:

City of Pomeroy, Pool Renovation, 86-042D: Mr. Pinnix was informed that there were no restrictions on use of the LWCF monies (\$150,000) so long as it is not for maintenance. Major rehabilitation only of the facility applies.

Skagit County, Renovation of Clear Lake Park, 86-044D: Mr. Fairleigh, Project Manager, informed Ms. Cox that there has not been a problem with stagnant water in Clear Lake, and that the property was purchased by the County one year ago.

Port of Skagit County, Replacement of Wooden Guest Moorage Float, 86-057D: In response to Mr. Mackey's question, Mr. Fairleigh stated the float was for guest moorage.

City of Lynnwood, Meadowdale Playfields, IAC 86-045D: Interest was expressed in the cooperation of this joint development by the cities of Edmonds and Lynnwood, Snohomish County, and the Edmonds School District. It was noted that waterfront access is slightly south of the playfields project. Ms. Cox asked if the fields as planned would be durable since the surface would not be of grass. Mr. Webster explained the soil conditions in the area were very conducive to this type of field. When wet down and dragged, the surface keeps a good consistency for a playfield. Mr. Fairleigh pointed out available parking areas in reply to Ms. Cox's question, and noted the public access to the park.

City of Vancouver, Burnt Bridge Creek Acquisition, 86-054A: Mr. Mackey was informed that the large creek is located to the south of the project but does meander through the site. The donated portion (.3 acres) has been appraised. An existing park (Arnold Park) was outlined on the map in response to Mr. Mackey's question. Mr. Alexander was informed the development will probably be phased with emphasis on a passive site. The project ties together Leverich Park and Arnold Park and the City will take this into consideration in its development plans.

Pullman Parks/Recreation, Lawson Park Development, 86-029D: Mr. Mackey was informed that the gardening projects in that area are not near the Lawson Park Development project.

King County, Burke Gilman to Sammamish River "Final Link", 86-059A: Ms. Warden was informed the trail would be for bikers, hikers, skate-board users, etc. Mr. Pinnix asked what the "incidental acquisition costs" were. Mr. Fairleigh stated these would consist of appraisal review costs, fees, taxes, etc.

Lewis County Parks and Recreation, Park Acquisition, 86-058A: There was some discussion as to the depth of the gravel pit pond. The sponsor replied this particular gravel pit pond had a depth of 22'.

Bellevue Parks and Recreation, Newcastle Beach Park Development, 86-033D: The question was raised as to the home on the property and its disposition. Mr. Fairleigh stated the home had been acquired with the acquisition of the property and would be removed as part of the development plans.

City of Kennewick, Swimming Pool Renovation, 86-066D: Question was asked if the

bond issue had passed. Mr. Fairleigh replied it had not passed, but the City had decided to proceed with the project anyway. The bond issue had been for indoor complex pool as well as renovation of the Municipal Swimming Pool constructed in 1952.

City of Seattle, South Lake Union Park, 86-027D: Anne Cox asked if the City felt it worthwhile to fund such a small site. Mr. Ron Taylor, Project Manager, replied it is in an area used by the public where there is very limited access now. The site was purchased in 1984 to expand public open space opportunities in the downtown area of Seattle and is an important link in a chain of pathways and mall parks and street ends which will eventually circle Lake Union. The parking facilities were discussed, and it was reported that the City would be controlling the parking with certain portions set aside strictly for park use. Mr. Webster pointed out that currently the parking area is being used for day parking by employees of businesses close by. When the park is developed an area will be designated as limited parking. Mrs. Warden was informed the park was south of the Gas Works Park. The Navy Reserve Facility was noted also.

City of Richland, Leslie Groves Park Phase IV Development, 86-015D: Mr. Mackey asked that the main road in the area be pointed out on the map. He noted that the area was downstream from the Hanford Works and asked if the water quality was good in the beach area. Mr. Fairleigh stated the City had assured the IAC staff that the water quality is very good -- and there is no problem.

Vashon Park District, Vashon Pool Renovation, 86-019D: Ms. Marsden asked for information on the bond issue and its non-passage. The bond issue did not pass because it did not receive a majority of 60%, only 57%.

Port of Bremerton, Bremerton First Street Dock Enhancement, 86-022D: In reply to Mr. Alexander, Mr. Taylor called upon Mr. Ken Attebery, Director, Planning and Development, Port of Bremerton. Mr. Attebery stated there would not be any moorage fees charged to the public at the Bremerton First Street Dock project.

City of Tacoma, Cummings Boat Property, Phase I, 86-008D: Mr. Taylor reviewed the parking area site for Mr. Jones. Mr. Webster indicated on the map the areas which had been cleared off for the parking site.

Tacoma PUD, Alder Lake Recreation Area, Phase 3, 86-052D: Mr. Tveten asked if FERC (Federal Energy Regulations Commission) mandates had been explored on this project, or were these stipulations required. Mr. Taylor replied it was not necessary for this project to work with the FERC. Mr. Tveten pointed out that for PUD's and private companies to develop parks, it is necessary to obtain a Federal license and specifically state there is a commitment to provide recreation facilities on the site. He commended the City of Tacoma going beyond the licensing needs on Alder Lake in order to put into use a recreation facility needed by the citizens. He felt the Committee should recognize the City of Tacoma for its development of outstanding facilities besides Alder Lake and cited Mayfield Lake as an example.

City of Tacoma Metropolitan Park District, Pt. Defiance Transient Moorage, 86-009D: Mr. Tveten asked if there would be opportunity for fishing piers at some time? Mr. Alexander (Department of Fisheries Designee) said his department was looking into this for the future, and that there is at the present time a fishing pier

further down the shoreline from the project site. Mr. Costello, Department of Fisheries, also noted that the pier does not go out into deep water and the department is considering rebuilding the boat house and building a larger scale fishing pier for public use. If this should be built, there would be no need for a fishing pier at the Pt. Defiance site.

City of Yakima, Sarg Hubbard Park, Phase II, Yakima River Greenway, 86-031D: Mr. Tveten advised the Committee of the history of the Yakima River Greenway and the proposals to place recreational sites on the river. The Legislature had directed the State Parks and Recreation Commission to make a study of the Yakima River Greenway. Later the Greenway Foundation was formed. The citizens of Yakima, the Foundation, the Department of Game, and State Parks all assisted in planning for this unique Greenway Project. He felt it was a most successful story and much is being done to place into operation recreational areas along the Yakima River for the public's use.

Kitsap County Parks & Recreation, Island Lake County Park, 86-013D: The staff assured Ms. Marsden that most of the project was not hilly, though there might be a gentle slope towards the back area.

Port of Kalama, Boat Launch Improvement, 86-050D: Mr. Jones inquired whether there had been any planning in regard to use of the site by the handicapped. He was assured that staff, per State and Federal laws, and as a matter of course ensure that all parks and recreation areas funded by the IAC meet use by the handicapped. However, Mr. Taylor did point out that in this particular project access for the handicapped is a bit difficult over the water. The project does, however, have facilities available for the handicapped at a viewing area and as access.

Mr. Pinnix asked why there had been so much damage to the facility and why was it being recommended for replacement if such damage might reoccur. Mr. Taylor stated the site was in an area where it received draft from large ships coming up the river causing rip-rap material, etc., to deteriorate. There is no way to stop this washing action. However, the park is needed and receives considerable use. Mr. Alexander observed there is a very high use of the facility, especially by fishermen. Mr. Taylor stated staff felt the sponsor had presented a viable project, that what is being proposed by way of replacement of existing gravel, rip-rap fill, etc., will weather substantially better than materials placed in the project before. Ms. Marsden stated the site was a very long way from the Marine Park and she didn't feel there was any other facility in between the two.

Yelm School District, Prairie Elementary School, Community Recreation Facilities, 86-041D: Ms. Marsden asked if play equipment was not already provided by the school. Mr. Taylor replied it was, but the school building facilities are separate from the community recreation facilities. The playfields will be a joint use facility....all play equipment available to everyone in the community who wishes to use it.

Port of Friday Harbor, Restroom Facilities/View Deck, 86-041D: Mr. Mackey was informed there were some restroom facilities at the site presently at the ferry landing. Also shower needs for boaters, etc., are available.

Port of Longview, Riverfront Park, 86-040D: Ms. Warden questioned the advisability of a park in the location viewed. Mr. Taylor stressed the project would provide a good public access for passive family and group activities, and there is

significant public demand for waterfront use. Highways were pointed out on the slide and the Department of Transportation's interests. The DOT owns the property and leases it to the Port of Longview.

City of Monroe, Pickett Property Acquisition, 86-065A: Mr. Webster, in response to a question, stated that the acquisition of the property would qualify for use of Initiative 215 funds but that the community park would not because it is not a water-dependent use project.

Suquamish Indian Tribe, Suquamish Boat Landing, 86-005D: It was noted that this project would be expanding a fishing pier -- a new ramp and float would be attached to a dock rehabilitated by an IAC grant in 1983. Mr. Mackey was informed there would be no problem in obtaining Department of Game and Department of Fisheries permits.

The project slide presentation concluded at 10:20 a.m. Mr. Tveten mentioned that the Lewis County project (Day-Use Park Acquisition) would provide opportunities for swimming in the southern part of Lewis County, and would open up a new activity for residents of that area. In discussing Friday Harbor's project (Restroom Facilities and View Deck, 86-041D), he noted that most of the harbor facilities now are for permanent moorage, not for transient moorage. He asked for staff's recommendation for funding that project. Mr. Webster stated staff was recommending the project be funded only at 25% Initiative 215 funds based on the fact that at least one-half of the facilities there would be uses other than transient moorage.

Ms. Cox thanked the staff for their projects presentations and called for funding recommendations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff distributed to the Committee and the audience memorandum dated November 7, 1985, "Local Agencies Project Funding Recommendations". Mr. Webster cited the criteria used in the recommendation:

- Amount of available funding for local projects;
- Source of funding and relative restrictions;
- Relative ranking of the 38 projects as determined through the Evaluation System;
- Suggested funding guidelines of maximum of 50 percent IAC participation with a \$150,000 ceiling.
- The attempt to fund as many worthy projects as possible.

The Available Funding of Local Projects indicated the following (with \$2,521,214 available).

SOURCE	TOTAL	SOURCE OF FUNDS		
		LWCF	INIT. 215	STATE BOND
Cash on Hand (Fund Summary)	\$ 761,153	\$ 112,391	\$ 332,441	\$ 316,321
Projected Receipts to 6-30-86				
Estimated Apportionment LWCF	400,000	400,000	-0-	-0-
Estimated Reapportionment LWCF	80,831	80,831	-0-	-0-
Estimated Allotment Authority	766,530	-0-	-0-	766,530
Estimated Receipts from D.O.L.	512,700	-0-	512,700	-0-
TOTAL ESTIMATED AVAILABLE	\$ 2,521,214	\$ 593,222	\$ 845,141	\$ 1,082,851

Mr. Webster also advised the Committee that the ranking scores were a result of the Technical Advisory Committee review and the Evaluation Team process. He commended the Technical Advisory Committee for its many hours devoted to review and assistance to each project, and praised the Evaluation Team's efforts during the four and a half days of review and scoring each project.

He mentioned that reductions in costs on some projects had been reviewed with the sponsors.

The projects as listed on page 12 of these minutes were recommended for funding by staff.

Mr. Webster emphasized that staff funding recommendations were contingent upon the receipt of Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) in the amount of \$400,000 (for local agencies), and contingent upon the sale of bonds as authorized in the 1985-87 Capital Budget in the final appropriation amount of at least \$766,530 for local funding. Mr. Webster then read the listing of projects and the funding recommendations for each one. (SEE PAGE 12)

Discussion followed. Mr. Tveten reminded the Committee that if the entire \$2,531,214 were authorized for the projects today, it would mean the Committee has spent all of its available funds at this point in time. Further, some of the monies rely on the sale of the bonds. If the Supreme Court makes a decision or the matter is returned to the State Legislature, the Committee is still dealing with contingency funds -- the monies will be received in the future. Mr. Wilder pointed out there would be a small balance of Initiative 215 funds left and about \$1,000 in Land and Water Conservation Funds. Mr. Tveten asked the timeframe for receipt of the LWCF monies.

Ms. Brand (NPS) replied that as soon as the budget passes Congress, the National Park Service is set up to allocate the funds very quickly. She anticipated monies could be received sometime in late November 1985.

Mr. Webster stated the project sponsors had been briefed on the contingency aspect of the funds and are aware that if they start their projects, go out to bid, etc., they are are their own and do so at their own risk. Mr. Tveten inquired what this will do to the acquisition cost estimates - if they don't get an answer as to funding by February or even March. Mr. Webster stated in many cases the project sponsors have not had their appraisals done, but have merely given the staff a Letter of Opinion. Once they know funding is forthcoming, they will do the appraisal and have it on hand. The sponsor is also aware in sending in a Letter of Opinion that if the appraisal comes in at a higher figure, it is their responsibility.

Mr. Webster informed Mr. Mackey that there were sufficient Initiative 215 funds left on the table, that these were more than adequate to cover any potential reductions as a result of surveys. Mr. Mackey asked the reasoning behind switching funds on Table I for LWCF and putting these into State Bonds instead, specifically the Lynnwood and Bellevue projects (Lynnwood, Meadowdale Playfields - Bellevue, Newcastle Beach Renovation). Mr. Webster replied Lynnwood's project affects an agreement the City has with the School District in terms of certain lands and uses thereof which may or may not fall within LWCF guidelines. The Newcastle project funds were moved because the Bellevue project already has LWCF fund use, and it is better to place those funds in a project which already has Federal funds and has already met

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Staff Recommendations for Funding in November, 1985
Table Number 2

Rank	Project Name	Reg	Sponsor Name	Score	LCRF	Bonds	I 215	LCF Total	Sponsor Share	Project Total	Rank
1	Pool Renovation	13	Poceroz	141.8	150,000	0	0	150,000	195,980	349,980	4
2	Clear Lake Park Renovation	3	Skaigt County Parks & Rec	132.6	142,100	0	0	142,100	142,100	284,200	5
3	Guest Moorage Float Replacement	3	Skaigt County, Port of	131.0	0	0	103,000	103,000	103,000	206,000	5
4	Meadowdale Playfields	4	Lynnwood, City of	125.2	0	150,000	0	150,000	240,000	390,000	3
5	Burnt Bridge Creek Acquisition	6	Vancouver, City of	123.7	0	150,000	0	150,000	160,320	310,320	4
6	Safe Fare Park	4	Auburn, City of	120.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Laxson Park Development	12	Pullman Parks & Rec.	120.0	0	150,000	0	150,000	320,800	470,800	3
8	Burke/Bil-Sassish R Trail Link	4	King County Parks & Rec.	119.4	0	77,500	0	77,500	77,500	155,000	5
9	Vance Creek County Park	2	Grays Harbor County	118.1	150,000	0	0	150,000	150,000	300,000	5
10	Day Use Park Acquisition	5	Lewis County Parks & Rec.	117.8	0	32,150	0	32,150	32,150	64,300	5
11	Newcastle Beach Park Dev.	4	Bellevue Parks & Rec.	117.1	150,000	0	0	150,000	1,477,430	1,627,430	1
12	Swimming Pool Renovation	10	Kennewick, City of	115.8	0	150,000	0	150,000	700,000	850,000	1
13	South Lake Union Park	4	Seattle, City of	114.5	0	132,891	0	132,891	132,891	265,782	5
14	Leslie Groves Park, Phase 4	10	Richland, City of	114.2	0	150,000	0	150,000	150,000	300,000	5
15	Vashon Pool Renovation	4	Vashon Park District	110.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	First Street Dock Enhancement	4	Bremerton, Port of	110.1	0	0	74,177	74,177	74,177	148,354	5
17	Spray Pool	8	Harrah, Town of	109.8	0	10,399	0	10,399	10,399	20,798	5
18	Cummings Boat Property, Ph. 2	4	Tacoma MPD	109.7	0	79,911	0	79,911	220,089	300,000	1
19	Alder Lake Rec. Area, Phase 3	4	Tacoma PUD	109.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Two Rivers Boat Launch Facility	10	Benton County Parks & Rec	109.0	0	0	82,617	82,617	82,618	165,235	1
	Pt. Defiance Transient Moorage	4	Tacoma MPD	107.9	0	150,000	0	150,000	150,000	300,000	1
	Berg Hubbard Park, Phase II	8	Yakima, County of	106.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	Island Lake County Park	4	Kitsap County Parks	105.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	Boat Launch Improvement	6	Kalama, Port of	103.6	0	0	83,575	83,575	83,575	167,150	1
25	City Beach Park, Phase II	3	Oak Harbor, City of	103.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	County Rec. Fac.-Prairie Elec.	5	Yelm School District	99.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	Restroom Facilities/View Deck	3	Friday Harbor, Port of	99.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	Vantage Boat Ramp	8	Kittitas Co./Grant Co. PUD	97.6	0	0	30,000	30,000	30,000	60,000	1
29	Kasch Park Soccer Fields	4	Everett, City of	95.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	Riverfront Park (Passive)	6	Longview, Port of	94.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	Moxee Park, Phase II	8	Moxee, City of	93.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	Pickett Property Acquisition	4	Monroe, City of	93.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
33	Marina Observation Deck	4	Port Orchard, City of	94.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34	Kitsap Lk Launch Ramp-Trip Pkg	4	Bremerton, City of	93.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
35	Waterway Trail Improvements	2	Ocean Shores, City of	92.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	Sport Court	2	Westport, City of	91.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
37	Lions Club Park Acquisition	6	Kalama, City of	91.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
38	Squamish Boat Landing	4	Squamish Tribe	70.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL					582,100	1,082,851	523,369	2,198,320	4,537,029	6,735,349	

Federal compliance responsibilities.

Stan Scott clarified the Initiative 215 funds for Mr. Pinnix stating that the reduction he had spoken to earlier in the Initiative 215 funds would not impact that fund significantly. Approximately \$36,000 would need to be "paid back", and this reduction is minimal. Mr. Mackey then asked why the Committee could not then use this money and fund projects with it. Mr. Webster again stated the projects before the Committee were the best and most viable projects, that they had been reviewed by TAC and the Evaluation Committee, and had gone through the process. The staff needs to retain some Initiative 215 monies in order to do the best job possible for the sponsors and the Committee. At the next funding session, he had knowledge of good, outstanding projects which would be coming before the Committee for funding, and Initiative 215 monies would be needed for many of those. He emphasized if a project was not considered a "good project", the staff would not recommend it.

In response to Mr. Mackey's further questioning, Mr. Webster said the Technical Advisory Committee serves only as a technical committee and makes suggestions concerning projects. It does not recommend projects per se. The Evaluation Team then scores the projects. Whether the project should go through the scoring process is left up to the sponsor. Mr. Mackey said he would like to go back and review projects #34, 35 and 38: Kitsap Lake Launch Ramp; City of Bremerton; Waterway Trail Improvements, Ocean Shores; & Suquamish Boat Landing, Suquamish Tribe.

Mr. Tveten asked when the Initiative 215 funds would be received -- \$332,441 as noted on Table I. Mr. Scott replied it would be received by June 30, 1986.

Ms. Warden commented she thought it was good that the IAC Committee doesn't spend the money just because it is available. She was interested in the Port of Kalama Boat Launch Improvement Project and whether it would be a feasible project and useful. Mr. Taylor replied the staff was assured the project was viable though there will have to be additional engineering tests performed to deal with the construction of the rip-rap.

Kitsap Lake Boat Launch Ramp, City of Bremerton, 86-004D: Mr. Mackey was informed there had to be additional engineering design work done on this particular project, nothing has been detailed for construction purposes yet. Mr. Mackey said he was then in agreement on staff's recommendation not to fund that project.

City of Ocean Shores, Waterway Trail Improvements, 86-055D: Mr. Taylor redescribed this project. Mr. Mackey asked why staff did not feel it was a good project. Mr. Taylor replied the Evaluation System had scored it low on several points. Mr. Wilder pointed out that some projects were ranked lower than others, and this was an indication that those projects were not the best proposals for the area. All projects have been through the TAC and the Evaluation Team. With another funding session (1986), it is important that the Committee have funds it may expend to local agencies. He said it would be easy for staff to recommend funding them all, but the process is to score and rank them and recommend the best to the Committee. With new information and needs the Committee could then make its decisions.

Mr. Tveten spoke in favor of the Ocean Shores project, stating the area was a unique place for recreational pursuits. It not only has the dunes area and beaches, but also provides canals and lakes for use of boaters. There is also an interpretive center just south of the canal which people can visit. There are plans, also, to make Damion Point (south of the project site) a significant area for recreationists. Mr. Alexander also favored funding of the project, citing the fact that the Dept. of Fisheries has been working with the Ocean Shores community to assist them in dealing with the economy issue caused by less fishing opportunities. The community has taken upon itself the planning of alternative recreation opportunities in order to attract all kinds of recreationists, not just the fishermen. He felt the project from an economic standpoint was excellent.

Mr. Tveten noted that the State Parks and Recreation Commission has an interest in a \$40,000 project from the Aquatic Lands Funds to develop Damion Point for interpretive purposes. The staff indicated on the map for Ms. Warden the locations of roads leading to the area providing the canals.

Mr. Robert Olander, City Manager, Ocean Shores, briefly reviewed the need for the project and how it would fit in with the recreational opportunities available at Ocean Shores. He said the canal provided twenty miles of water interconnected with lakes; along the shores are resident lots; the lakes have been stocked with fish in order that there may be fishing all year long; and the facilities are not just available to those in the area but to everyone who comes to Ocean Shores. Ms. Cox asked if the land along the shores would be considered private lands. Mr. Olander replied the land was private, but most of it is as yet undeveloped. The canals are very wide and allow for privacy. Most landowners, Mr. Olander felt, would not consider boaters as invading their privacy.

At this point Mr. Mackey asked the total amount of Initiative 215 funds which would be carried over and not expended today. Mr. Scott replied \$332,000.

Suquamish Indian Tribe, Suquamish Boat Landing, 86-005D: Mr. Taylor redescribed the Suquamish Indian Tribe's boat landing project. He explained that the float attached to the dock would be removable and it would be possible to store it during the winter months at Miller Bay, about a mile from the site.

Ms. Leota Anthony, Treasurer, Suquamish Indian Tribe, commented on the heavy use of the dock and the fact that it is used community-wide. In response to Mr. Tveten's questions, Mr. Mike Bonhoff, Planner, Suquamish Indian Tribe, said it was difficult to hold a boat on the beach while someone is parking their car, and the float would allow stability and a tie-up point for boaters.

Mr. Pinnix was given the past history on funding of Initiative 215 projects. Staff had always elected to retain sufficient monies to meet contingencies and for additional monies to fund projects at the next funding session. Also, Mr. Wilder pointed out that projects must be boater-oriented for use of Initiative 215 funds. He said staff was following the funding process and if there are exceptions the Committee wishes to make, that is the purpose of the Committee. Ms. Warden stated that projects not funded at this session may come back to the next funding session for consideration.

Mr. Webster advised Ms. Marsden that the Ocean Shores project was being considered for the second time and the Suquamish Indian Tribe project for the first time. Mr. Alexander asked if the Suquamish Indian Tribe project was actually phase 2, noting that it had received prior IAC funding. Mr. Bonhoff replied in the affirmative. Ms. Cox reminded the Committee that the staff and TAC, with the Evaluation Team, had already reviewed these projects and the Ocean Shores Project was ranked as #35. She asked that this be kept in mind.

There followed some discussion on the point system and identifying the criteria which would cause a project to rank low. Both Mr. Pinnix and Mr. Jones inquired in this regard. Mr. Webster stated it was difficult to surmise what the individual evaluators were stressing in ranking a project with low points. Each is unique and the point system is only one method of evaluating projects. In the Suquamish Indian Tribe Project he felt the project may have ranked low due to the fact that commercial fishermen would be using the dock as well as the public. Ms. Marsden was assured that the staff works with each project sponsor in relation to its comprehensive plan which has qualified them to come to the IAC for assistance.

At this point Mr. Bonhoff advised the Committee it would be possible for the Tribe to ensure that there would be no commercial use of the floats. The Tribe would be able to "police" the area.

Comments from the local sponsors were called for by the Chair:

COMMENTS FROM PROJECT SPONSORS:

Mr. Larry Cote, Project Coordinator, Kitsap County Parks - Kitsap County Island Lake Park Project - 86-013D:

- (1) Thanked the staff for their assistance. Disappointed to be ranked as Number 23. Feel the project is a good one and family-oriented.
- (2) Pointed out Kitsap County is rated as fastest growing area in the state at the present time. Grew in the last five years by 13 1/2%. Project is needed to supply recreation to citizens in the area.
- (3) Were funded by IAC in 1983 to assist in acquiring the land. Kitsap County was also fortunate in that adjacent property is being donated. Will have more than 2,200 feet of freshwater shoreline available in the project.
- (4) Felt Evaluation Team overlooked the rising population in the area and may have ranked it too low.

Mr. Webster stated it was fair to say that the Evaluation Team did seem to be more conservative with point evaluations this year than last year's team. The project was ranked with an entirely new set of projects and this will change the point values. The Evaluation Team ranked the project as reviewed against others. Ms. Marsden pointed out that the Committee would be affecting the ranking of all the other projects on the recommended listing from staff if it were to fund this project. She felt the project sponsor should bring it back again for funding consideration at the next funding session. Ms. Warden agreed with her.

Mr. Cote felt the project would probably have been recommended if the points given to it last funding session had been the same this time. Mr. Wilder agreed with Ms. Marsden and Ms. Warden that a project may be resubmitted for consideration.

Michael Valiga, Administrator, Port of Friday Harbor - Restroom Facilities/
View Deck - 86-041D:

- (1) Suggested the Committee consider separating the funding monies-- consider projects specifically for Initiative 215 separately from those for Land and Water Conservation Funds and Bond Funds. Felt this would alleviate the confusion in ranking of projects. Projects deal with different facilities and situations which affects the ranking.
- (2) Noted that in 1984 Funding Session there were some of the projects being considered today which ranked higher than at this session. (In 1985 they now rank lower.)
- (3) Not enough points are given to access, and use of the water is of the most primary importance. There is a difference between boat launches and beach access, which would affect ranking.
- (4) There should be a change in the make-up of the Evaluation Team. Presently, there was only one Association of Ports man on the team, the majority of the people were park and recreation professionals.
- (5) If separate funding sessions were held for the separate funds, i.e., Init. 215, LWCF, and Bonds, the combination projects should have to go through both funding sessions. Later the project sponsor could determine for which funding dollars he would like to apply.
- (6) Speaking specifically about Friday Harbor's project, noted it was recommended by staff at one time for one-half 215 and one-half Land and Water Conservation Funds. Was surprised to learn that staff had determined the project would be recommended for only Initiative 215 funds. Felt this was not fair and was unacceptable.
- (7) Friday Harbor is a transient boater facility in the San Juans and receives heavy use from boaters. Need has been demonstrated for this project, and requested the Committee fund it if at all possible.

Miki Brostrom, Resident of San Juan County - Port of Friday Harbor project -
Restroom Facilities/View Deck - 86-041D:

- (1) Introduced herself as past member and chairman of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (6 years) and therefore knowledgeable of the problems encountered by the Committee in its deliberations. Thirty year resident of the San Juan County area.
- (2) Could not support the project as was unable to see the benefits to transient boaters. There are available restroom facilities elsewhere -- mentioned their locations and that they do not appear to be overly used.

- (3) If project were completed, restrooms would probably not be used for ten months out of the year - only summer months would be affected.
- (4) Noted the increase in the number of small boats coming to Friday Harbor and the San Juan areas, and felt there was a greater need to provide facilities for these boaters in other places than at Friday Harbor.

Mr. Webster apologized to Mr. Valega as sponsor of the Friday Harbor Project for any misunderstanding. The project had been given 25% (\$36,100) of Initiative 215 funds and in a telephone conversation with the sponsor it was indicated that it could not be accomplished with that amount of money. He asked Mr. Valiga if it was now possible, and was informed the matter would have to be discussed with the San Juan County Commissioners. Mr. Valiga could not answer the question. The total project cost was \$133,405. The 25% Initiative 215 funds was predicated on the fact that the facility would be used by transient boaters. At this point Mr. Webster stated in staff's review (and TAC and Evaluation Team) it had been determined that approximately 50% use of the facility would be by non-boaters or non-transient boaters. Mr. Pinnix asked if the Committee were to approve the project and subsequently the Port was not able to proceed, would the Initiative 215 funds be returned to the Outdoor Recreation Account? Staff's answer was in the affirmative.

Harry Laban, Seattle Parks and Recreation Department - South Union Park Project
86-027D:

- (1) Assured the Committee that the project though relatively small would serve the recreational needs of South Lake Union. Thanked the staff for their efforts and assistance with the project.
- (2) Felt the Committee should not feel a project though lower in ranking is not a viable project. A project sponsor is not going to bring to the Committee a project that is not needed -- all are interested in recreational outlets for their areas. There is, however, danger in not approving projects which are high ranking and investing money in a non-meritorious project which may have ranked lower.

Barbara Harrer, Mayor, Town of Harrah - Spray Pool - 86-047D:

Expressed appreciation to the Committee for considering the funding of Harrah's Spray Pool, and for the assistance given to the Town by Ron Taylor, Project Manager, IAC.

MOTION TO FUND LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. MACKEY, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVES AND AFFIRMS THAT THE PROJECTS AS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF (PAGE 19 OF THESE MINUTES) ARE FOUND TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE WASHINGTON STATEWIDE COMPREHENSIVE OUTDOOR RECREATION PLAN AS ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON JULY 25, 1985, AND

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE IN ITS APPROVAL OF THESE PROJECTS FOR FUNDING AUTHORIZES THE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS 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;

WITH THE STIPULATION THAT LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDING AND GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FUNDING SO APPROVED IN THESE PROJECTS IS CONTINGENT UPON RECEIPT OF THESE FUNDS FOR THE 1985-87 BIENNIUM,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE LOCAL AGENCIES' PROJECTS AS LISTED ON PAGE 19 OF THESE MINUTES ARE HEREBY APPROVED FOR FUNDING FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT AS INDICATED IN THE FUNDING SCHEDULES.

AMENDMENT:

MR. MACKEY AMENDED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE THE FUNDING OF THE CITY OF OCEAN SHORES' WATERWAY TRAIL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT, 86-055D, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$18,810 INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS AND \$18,810 SPONSOR SHARE (TOTAL PROJECT COST OF: \$37,620).

MR. ALEXANDER SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

AMENDMENT:

MR. MACKEY AMENDED THE MOTION TO INCLUDE THE FUNDING OF THE SUQUAMISH INDIAN TRIBE'S SUQUAMISH BOAT LANDING PROJECT, 86-005D, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$23,200 INITIATIVE 215 FUNDS AND \$23,200 SPONSOR SHARE (TOTAL PROJECT COST OF: \$46,400).

MR. ALEXANDER SECONDED THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION AND IT WAS PASSED.

ORIGINAL MOTION:

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION BY THE CHAIR. MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY PASSED.

The Committee recessed at 1:00 p.m. and reconvened for the afternoon session at 2:02 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION - NOVEMBER 7, 1985

II. C. PROJECT SERVICES. 1. Administrative Actions - Project Status Report: Mr. Webster, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, "Project Services Division Report", and expressed his appreciation to the members of the Evaluations Committee for their time and talent in evaluating projects:

Glenn Clifton, Kelso
Michael Corso, Mountlake Terrace
Roger DeSpain, Whatcom County
Bill Hutsinpillar, King County
Mike Valiga, Port of Friday Harbor
John Edwards, Department of Natural Resources

LOCAL AGENCIES FUNDED AT NOVEMBER 7, 1985 IAC MEETING - OLYMPIA

PROJECT NAME	SPONSOR NAME	LWCF	BONDS	INIT. 215	SPONSOR	TOTAL
Pool Renovation	Pomeroy	\$ 510,000	-	-	\$ 199,980	\$ 349,980
Clear Lake Park Renovation	Skagit County	142,100	-	-	142,100	284,200
Guest Moorage Float Replace.	Skagit County, Port of	-	-	\$ 103,000	103,000	206,000
Meadowdale Playfields	Lynnwood, City of	-	\$ 150,000	-	240,000	390,000
Burnt Bridge Creek Acq.	Vancouver, City of	-	150,000	-	160,320	310,320
Lawson Park Development	Pullman Parks & Rec.	-	150,000	-	320,800	470,800
Burke-Gilman Samnish R. Trail	King Co. Parks & Rec.	-	77,500	-	77,500	155,000
Vance Creek County Park	Grays Harbor County	150,000	-	-	150,000	300,000
Day-Use Park Acquisition	Lewis Co. Parks & Rec.	-	32,150	-	32,150	64,300
Newcastle Beach Park Dev.	Bellevue Parks & Rec.	150,000	-	-	1,477,430	1,627,430
Swimming Pool Renovation	Kennewick, City of	-	150,000	-	700,000	850,000
South Lake Union Park	Seattle, City of	-	132,891	-	132,891	265,782
Leslie Groves Park, Ph. 4	Richland, City of	-	150,000	-	150,000	300,000
First Street Dock Enhancement	Bremerton, City of <i>Port of</i>	-	-	74,177	74,177	148,354
Spray Pool	Harrah, Town of	-	10,399	-	10,399	20,798
Cummings Boat Property, Ph. 2	Tacoma MPD	-	79,911	-	220,089	300,000
Two Rivers Boat Launch Fac.	Benton County P&R	-	-	82,617	82,618	165,235
Pt. Defiance Transient Moorage	Tacoma Metro. Pk. Dist.	-	-	150,000	150,000	300,000
Boat Launch Improvement	Kalama, Port of	-	-	83,575	83,575	167,150
Vantage Boat Ramp	Kittitas Co/Grant Co. PUD	-	-	30,000	30,000	60,000
Waterway Trail Improvements	Ocean Shores, City of	-	-	18,810	18,810	37,620
Suquamish Boat Landing	Suquamish Indian Tribe	-	-	23,200	23,200	46,400
		\$ 592,100	\$ 1,082,851	\$ 565,379	\$ 4,579,039	\$ 6,819,369

Approved by Amendments to the Committee's motion (Pg. 18 of these minutes).

OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT:

LWCF	\$ 592,100
BONDS - STATE	1,082,851
INIT. 215	565,379

\$ 2,240,330 OUTDOOR RECREATION FUND

Mr. Webster expressed a special thanks to Bob Cooper, Director of the Everett Park and Recreation Department, for making arrangements in Everett for the Evaluation Team sessions.

Approved Project Administration: Fifty-four active ongoing local agencies' projects are being maintained and assisted by the staff and 84 active state agencies' projects (in various stages of completion).

State Agencies' Master List Approval: The following project was noted as being approved from the Master List:

<u>Dept. of Fisheries</u>	85-802D	\$ 72,500 Bond Funds	\$ 72,500 LWCF
<u>Snow Creek Renovation</u>			

To redevelop/renovate support facilities for the mechanical boat launch at the Snow Creek recreation site, Strait of Juan De Fuca, Clallam County.

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Fund: Mr. Webster reported the first project recommended for funding from the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Fund, Department of Ecology:

<u>Dept. of Ecology</u>	S-AL-85-33	\$ 70,000	Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account
<u>Padilla Bay</u>	Dept. of Natl.		(ALEA)
	Resources		

Administrative Action: Mr. Webster reported the following cost increase approved by administrative action of the Director:

<u>City of Moxee</u>	<u>Swim Pool Renovation</u>	83-027D	\$ 6,500 IAC ORA
----------------------	-----------------------------	---------	------------------

This was approved to assist in covering cost overruns caused by unanticipated difficulties and changes in design of the pool.

Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account Program: Mr. Webster stated there had been fifty-one (51) project applications received from local agencies for grants from the Department of Natural Resources' new Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA) Program. IAC staff assisted the DNR staff in processing the applications. Each was evaluated and numerically scored by an evaluation team on October 29/30, 1985. The Commissioner of Public Lands will select projects for funding within few weeks. IAC staff will process the contracts and administer the projects for DNR. Mr. Webster called attention to the projects as listed in APPENDIX "D" of these minutes. Ten State Agencies' projects (Parks, Game, Fisheries, and DNR) will also be processed through the IAC.

2. City of Langley, Langley Boat Harbor Project, 78-045D: Mr. Larry Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, concerning the Langley Boat Harbor Project. He reported the project is now well underway in construction. The entire project was redesigned to include solid timber piling breakwater and 35 moorage slips. The IAC granted an additional \$100,000 to the City for this project in November, 1984; and the City of Langley has committed itself to issuing councilmatic bonds for approximately \$140,000 to allow full completion of the project. Further, the Department of Fisheries was successful in securing \$70,000 for construction of a fishing platform onto the Langley breakwater.

In commenting on the ALEA Program, Mr. Pinnix complimented the staff of the IAC for their work in getting good projects to evaluate.

Mr. Tveten asked the status of projects being closed. Mr. Webster reported staff has increased the amount of projects being finalized and in the last month about a dozen projects were closed. Mr. Tveten noted that those projects funded with Land and Water Conservation monies if closed in timely fashion increase the amount of monies allotted to the State of Washington from LWCF.

II D. PLANNING SERVICES. 1. Local Agencies, Technical Assistance: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff "Local Agencies, Technical Assistance", dated November 7, 1985, and reported as follows:

(a) In mid-October there were 119 eligible Park and Recreation Comprehensive Plans on file with the agency. Eight had "interim eligibility" for a period of one year. Interim eligibility is granted to those agencies who have projects under consideration for funding from the IAC and who have completed sufficient plan elements to allow them to be scored as part of the Evaluation process. Interim eligibility is granted for one year only.

(b) At present, there are 70 eligible cities; 18 counties; 4 port districts, 7 park and recreation districts; 7 school districts and 3 Indian Tribes having eligible plans on file.

2. Off-Road Vehicle Report: Mr. Greg Lovelady, Coordinator, Off-Road Vehicle Program, referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, "Off-Road Vehicle Report", noting the following:

(1) The Committee has approved 153 ORV projects - 53 still active, and 38 scheduled for completion by the end of the year. Since the first grants were awarded in March 1978, one hundred projects have been completed.

(2) The Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC) has met several times in 1985 -- to discuss and interview candidates for the ORV Plan Study, to become familiar with the evaluation of the ORV projects for the November 1985 IAC meeting, and to confer with staff on final project recommendations. A special thanks was extended to four representatives - Carol Jensen, Tom Thomson, Tom Jesmer, and Jim Carter - for their many hours of support and effort.

(3) ORV Plan: An update report noted that a Seattle consultant, Matrix Management Group has been hired to conduct the study. They will be aided by the Gilmore Research Group. Currently a format for telephone, mail, and personal interviews is being developed. This survey will be conducted in 1986.

(4) ORV Project Changes: Mr. Lovelady reported that the following administrative actions were taken in regard to ORV projects since the July 25, 1985 IAC meeting:

(a) Kittitas County, ORV 84-24E, ORV Education/Enforcement Program A cost increase (\$3,500) was awarded to cover increased liability insurance costs.

- (b) Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, ORV 82-1P, Greenwater River ORV Plan: Time extended 12 months (to December 1986) to permit additional data analysis; cost increased (\$3,000) to allow collection of additional census information.
- (c) Yakima County, ORV 84-16D, ORV Sports Park Development I: Project scope was increased to allow purchase of certain equipment.

3. Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff "Pacific Northwest Regional Recreation Committee", dated November 7, 1985, and updated status information on this group:

(1) Current task is the update of the recreation demand surveys previously accomplished by each of the three states between 1978 and 1980.

(2) A technical sub-committee is presently designing a questionnaire to be used by all three states (Washington, Oregon, Idaho) in establishing the demand data for use in future editions of the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans (SCORP) of all 3 states. In the past each state had developed its own questionnaire and conducted its own surveys. Now there will be coordination and any questions unique to an individual state can be added to the form for that particular state. Each state is handling costs of conducting its own survey.

(3) Compilation and storage of the data received from the questionnaires will be accomplished through the Western Washington University's computer services (scheduled for 1987).

4. Inventory Program: Mr. Pelton referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, "Inventory Program" as follows:

(1) The inventory will consist of the available Federal, state, local, and private recreation facilities available for public use.

(2) With addition of IBM Personal Computers in 1984, the IAC will now be able to handle directly many of the computer-related data required for planning purposes. Thus, the inventory data will be transferred from the Western Washington University where it has been stored to a new software program to be administered directly by IAC staff using IAC Personal Computers. Target date for completion of the transfer is December 31, 1985.

III A. PROJECT CHANGES: 1. Department of Game, Washougal River 74-610A, Land Exchange: The need for a land exchange in the Washougal River, Department of Game Project was explained by Larry Fairleigh, Project Manager. An adjacent landowner has consented to exchange a parcel of land containing .27 acres for land of the same size. This exchange will provide for additional parking by recreationists using the Game Department's facility. Opinion of value places both parcels at \$11,070.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKAY, SECONDED BY MRS. WARDEN, THAT

WHEREAS, IN 1974 THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME WITH INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION FUNDING ASSISTANCE ACQUIRED A 3.5 ACRE SITE KNOWN AS THE WASHOUGAL

RIVER ACCESS (IAC 74-610A), AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME AND AN ADJACENT LANDOWNER WISH TO CONSUMMATE A MUTALLY BENEFICIAL EXCHANGE OF PARCELS CONTAINING .27 ACRES EACH WITH AN EQUAL VALUE OF \$11,070, AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THIS EXCHANGE MEETS THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED,

- . THE EXCHANGE WILL BE OF BENEFIT TO THE RECREATING PUBLIC PROVIDING LAND FOR A GOOD PARKING AREA AND BY AN INCREASE IN AVAILABLE SHORELINE THROUGH THE ACCESS EASEMENT;
- . THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF EACH PARCEL IS IDENTICAL; AND
- . THE PARCEL TO BE ACQUIRED HAS A RECREATION UTILITY AT LEAST THAT OF THE PARCEL BEING EXCHANGED;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT THE EXCHANGE IS APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

2. Department of Game, Wenatchee River, IAC 74-621A: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff "Department of Game, Wenatchee River, 74-621A" which called for approval of a land exchange to benefit the Department of Game and the Department of Transportation. Recently an adjoining property owner to land of the Department of Game built a house with a portion of it inadvertently placed on part of the property of the fishing access site. The Chelan County Superior Court awarded the Department of Game \$2,000 (Fair Market Value of a .46 acre parcel of land accommodating the intruding house).

Mr. Fairleigh stated the Department of Game desired to use \$1,000 of the proceeds to acquire a permanent right for a grade crossing across the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way (near Buena, Yakima Co.). This would permit public access to public recreational areas.

The balance of the proceeds (\$1,000) would be used to acquire 14.43 acres of additional land to the I-82 public recreation access on the Yakima River, (known as the Dunbar Outlook - valued in excess of the \$1,000). Opinions of Value establish: \$2,000 Wenatchee River parcel, \$2,039 Dunbar Outlook parcel, railroad crossing, \$1,000.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. WARDEN, SECONDED BY MS. MARSDEN, THAT

WHEREAS, In 1974 THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME WITH INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FUNDING ASSISTANCE ACQUIRED A 25.20 ACRE SITE KNOWN AS THE WENATCHEE RIVER ACCESS, IAC 74-621A, AND

WHEREAS, THE CHELAN COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT HAS AWARDED THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME FAIR MARKET VALUE OF \$2,000 FOR THE LOSS OF .46 ACRES OF PROPERTY

ENCROACHED UPON BY AN ADJOINING LANDOWNER, AND

WHEREAS, THE DEPARTMENT OF GAME WISHES TO APPLY THE AWARDED FUNDS TOWARDS THE PURCHASE OF RIGHTS AND PROPERTIES OF GREATER VALUE ASSOCIATED WITH THE 1-82/YAKIMA RIVER RECREATION PROJECT (IAC 82-602A, 83-600A, AND 85-608D), AND

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THIS EXCHANGE MEETS THE CRITERIA SET FORTH IN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED,

- . THE PROPOSED REPLACEMENTS WILL BOTH BE OF BENEFIT TO THE RECREATING PUBLIC AS ELEMENTS OF THE 1-82/YAKIMA RIVER RECREATION CORRIDOR;
- . THE VALUE OF THE RIGHTS AND PROPERTY TO BE ACQUIRED EXCEEDS THE VALUE OF THE PROPERTY BEING CONVERTED;
- . THE RIGHTS AND PROPERTY TO BE ACQUIRED HAVE A RECREATION UTILITY AT LEAST EQUAL TO THAT OF PROPERTY BEING EXCHANGED.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION, THAT THE EXCHANGES ARE HEREBY APPROVED AND THE DIRECTOR IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY CONTRACT AMENDMENTS.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

3. Off-Road Vehicle Project - City of Othello-Feasibility Study, ORV 84-26P, Change in Scope, Time, and Cost Increase: Mr. Roger Dovel, Recreation Resource Planner (ORV), referred to the memorandum of staff concerning the City of Othello's Feasibility Study ORV Project and the need to provide additional time and funds to continue funding a portion of the salary and benefits of the Project Coordinator, perform necessary land appraisals, purchase consultant assistance necessary for plan modifications, and associated costs for travel, printing, and preliminary title report fees. Mr. Dovel noted that the first site selected by the Adams County Park and Recreation District was found to be environmentally incompatible for outdoor recreation activities. In order to continue a search for a suitable site, Adams County officials requested an extension of time, increase in cost, and change in scope.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKAY, SECONDED BY MR. PINNIX, THAT

WHEREAS, THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION APPROVED THE CITY OF OTHELLO'S OFF-ROAD VEHICLE MINI-PARK STUDY (ORV 84-26P) ON NOVEMBER 13, 1984, AT A TOTAL COST OF \$9,000, AND

WHEREAS, THE CITY OF OTHELLO HAS DEMONSTRATED THE NEED FOR A COST INCREASE OF \$9,000, FOR A TOTAL PROJECT COST OF \$18,000, A TIME EXTENSION, AND A CHANGE OF SCOPE RELATED TO THIS PROJECT, AND

WHEREAS, SUCH A CONTRACT CHANGE WOULD ALLOW THE CITY OF OTHELLO TO CONTINUE TO FUND A PORTION OF THE SALARY AND BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT COORDINATOR, PERFORM NECESSARY LAND APPRAISALS, PURCHASE CONSULTANT ASSISTANCE NECESSARY FOR PLAN MODIFICATIONS, AND ASSOCIATED COSTS FOR TRAVEL, PRINTING, AND PRELIMINARY

TITLE REPORT FEES,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE THAT AN INCREASE IN THE SCOPE, COST (\$9,000), AND TIME OF THIS PROJECT IS APPROVED IN ORDER TO CONTINUE THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS FOR AN ORV MINI-PARK, AND RELATED PRELIMINARY SITE EVALUATION AND PLANNING.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

4. King County, Lake Wilderness Trail, IAC 80-052A - SR 169 Right-of-Way: Mr. Fairleigh referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, concerning the King County Lake Wilderness Trail Project. (A set of maps indicating the railroad right-of-way and recreational corridor was distributed to each Committee member by Mr. Webster.) King County had received a request from the Department of Transportation (DOT) for a taking of certain property necessary to accomplish improvements to S.R. 169 in the Maple Valley area. This conversion/replacement required Committee review and approval without the immediate replacement of the land or facilities taken. Staff met with those involved in the proposed transaction and recommended that the IAC members authorize the Director to approve the release by King County of 2.08 acres to the Department of Transportation for improvements to S.R. 169.

Question was asked as to the time element and the need to proceed. Mr. Webster confirmed that staff is very confident the project will be carried out as discussed with King County and the Department of Transportation. It is most desirous to obtain the recreational corridor lands along the Cedar River from Renton to the Maple Valley/Lake Wilderness trail property, and this proposal would assist to some extent.

In response to Mr. Tveten, Mr. Jerry Gilbert, Department of Transportation, emphasized the need for the exchange, stating that the project would have to go through the Federal Bureau of Abandonment, but this would not be a problem.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. MARSDEN; SECONDED BY MS. WARDEN, THAT

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY PARKS ACQUIRED PROPERTY KNOWN AS THE MAPLE VALLEY/LAKE WILDERNESS TRAIL (IAC 80-052A), AND

WHEREAS, THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REQUIRES A PORTION OF THAT PROPERTY FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO S.R. 169, AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY IS WILLING TO RELEASE 2.08 ACRES TO WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION UNDER THE TERMS OF AN AGREEMENT BY WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO REPLACE THE PROPERTY AT A FUTURE DATE AT THEN CURRENT VALUES, AND

WHEREAS, KING COUNTY CANNOT NOW MEET THE PROVISIONS OF THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED,

WHEREAS, THE UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION IS IN NEED OF AT LEAST A "CLEAR PATH OF TITLE" PRIOR TO BEING ABLE TO ADVERTISE FOR BID IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS AT S.R. 169 AND WITTE ROAD AND THE S.R. 169 CEDAR RIVER BRIDGE REPLACEMENT PROJECT,

WHEREAS, CURRENT CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULES CALL FOR THESE TWO PROJECTS TO BEGIN WORK IN THE SPRING/SUMMER OF 1986 AND DELAY WOULD CAUSE ADDED COSTS TO THE PROJECT AND THE PUBLIC, AND

WHEREAS, THE PROPOSED AREA FOR REPLACEMENT OF THIS PROPERTY IS PART OF A FUTURE LARGER TRAIL ACQUISITION,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION THAT THE DIRECTOR, IN THE INTEREST OF THE PUBLIC GOOD, IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO TEMPORARILY WAIVE THE REQUIREMENTS OF IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #7, SECTION 07.19A, ACQUISITION PROJECTS CONVERTED, AND EXECUTE THOSE DOCUMENTS NECESSARY FOR RELEASE OF PROPERTY BY KING COUNTY TO THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

11. B. 2. FUND SUMMARY - OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS: Mr. Scott called attention of the Committee members to the Off-Road Vehicle Fund Status Report dated October 24, 1985. He quoted certain figures on the summary and noted that \$2,076,044.48 was available in ORV funds at the present time.

IV. C. OFF-ROAD VEHICLES PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS: At 2:45 p.m. Ms. Cox called for presentation of the Off-Road Vehicle Projects. Mr. Lovelady referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, "1985 Off-Road Vehicle Report", and noted that:

(1) A total of 38 ORV project applications were received. Of these, four were withdrawn by sponsors and one was combined with another proposal. Thirty-three projects remained in the five categories of: education/enforcement, plans/studies, capital development/equipment acquisitions, management, and land acquisitions. All projects were reviewed and evaluated by the IAC's Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC) and subsequently scored by staff according to the evaluation system.

He noted there would be three new agencies requesting Educ/Enforcement funding from the ORV monies at this session of the IAC: Pierce County, Mason County, and the Tacoma Metropolitan Parks Department. The other six agencies requesting assistance in this category have already received considerable assistance: Richland Police Dept., Chelan/Douglas County Sheriff, Yakima County Sheriff Department, Thurston County Parks Department, Kittitas County Sheriff Department, and the Grant County Sheriff Department.

A slide presentation was given by Mr. Lovelady of the overall Off-Road Vehicle Education/Enforcement programs throughout the state. Comments were made about each program and its usefulness to the ORV users.

Questions from the Committee were answered by Mr. Lovelady concerning the primary purpose of the education/enforcement programs, the need to patrol ORV use areas and inform users of the rules and regulations pertaining to ORVs, and the school educational programs aimed at the younger users. He informed the Committee that most deputies in the sheriffs' departments had

been in the program for some time and are not "moved around" as to duties/responsibilities within the sheriffs' offices.

There was some discussion concerning the use of the three and four-wheel type off-road vehicles on trails. Mr. Lovelady stressed that most of the trails are too narrow for these vehicles and they make use of other riding areas.

Slides of the off-road vehicle projects were then shown by staff in the categories of PLANNING, CAPITAL PROJECTS, MANAGEMENT PROJECTS, AND LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT. (8 planning, 9 capital projects, 5 management and one land acquisition project.)

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMITTEE: During the presentation, the following projects received comments from the Committee members:

ORV 12-P, USFS Colville, Supervisor's Office - Forest ORV Study: In response to Mr. Tveten's question, Mr. Lovelady stated all projects requiring consultation with the Department of Game as to impacts on wildlife had received this input.

ORV 14-P, USFS Colville, Newport Rng. District - Batey-Bould Trailhead Plan: Explanation was given to Ms. Marsden that trails in the Forest Service area were multi-purpose - open to anyone wanting to use them.

ORV 17-P, USFS Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Supervisor's Office - ORV Private Lands Survey: Questions were asked concerning the survey related to private lands. There are privately-owned segments of trails in this area (approximately 93 miles) which are deteriorating. The project proposes to investigate the feasibility of acquiring sufficient interest in those segments of Forest Service trails which cross private lands to allow for the use of public monies to upgrade them. Mr. Tveten said there had been a study done some years ago about the liability of property owners to those using their lands. He suggested this study might be of some assistance in developing the ORV Private Lands Survey. In the discussion, it was pointed out that the resume should contain the wording "PUBLIC OWNERSHIP INTEREST" rather than just "public interest", to denote that the survey involves owners of the lands on which the trails exist.

ORV 22-P, USFS Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Cle Elum Rng. Dist. - Teanaway Area Trail Survey: Ms. Cox asked if this was the hiking area of Alpine Lakes she had heard about. Mr. Lovelady said that area was not within the wilderness area of this particular project.

ORV 33-P, Snohomish County Parks and Recreation Department - ORV Feasibility Study: In response to questions, Mr. Lovelady said approx. 4 other counties (Thurston, Pierce, Benton, and Spokane) have taken a direct interest in ORV studies. Mr. Pelton noted that of the 13 park and recreation departments eligible now, five or six have looked at the concept of funding ORV areas.

ORV 34-P, Ferry County, Parks and Recreation District - ORV Recreation Area Study: Mr. Dovel explained that this project involved a number of people in the Lions Club at Republic who had indicated an interest in this type of study. The consultant, however, has not yet been selected.

ORV 85-13D, USFS, Colville-Newport Rngr. Dist. - Batey-Bould Trail Phase III: Mr. Lovelady, in response to questions, pointed out phase III consisted of new

trails. Mr. Jones asked if there were any standards set for marking the trails. Mr. Lovelady replied the Forest Service has three categories of trail standards: multi-purpose (includes trail motorcycles), four-wheel drive; and ATVs. Mr. Mike Dolfay, USFS, Trails Coordinator, Wenatchee Natl. Forest, stated there were standards for ATVs (3-wheel vehicles), but there has not been a demand as yet for development of these types of trails. Currently there is a project to look at sites for these types of trails, but this will not be completed until next year.

In the discussion on ATVs,* it was noted that there would be no reason to have separate trails for these vehicles since they could use the four-wheel drive vehicles trails. (*All-Terrain Vehicles)

ORV 19-D, USFS, Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Entiat Ranger Dist. - Mad River Trail #1409: Mr. Mackey asked why put a trail in that area if the soil is so unstable. Mr. Lovelady replied the trail is already there and does require considerable maintenance. Since it receives heavy use, there is a need to improve various segments of it. In some cases, the trail would be relocated to higher ground and because of the narrow width, there will also be some widening of the trail as well as stabilization. Ms. Warden pointed out the trail was a very important connection point -- it links other trails getting good use also. Ms. Cox asked if there were not other roads or trails in the area which could serve the public rather than doing extensive maintenance on the Mad River Trail (#1409). Mr. Lovelady agreed there were other roads in the area but not of this same type trail use. Much of the area of the Mad River, he said, goes through drainage areas and there are washouts due to the river's action. Mr. Pinnix was interested in the unstable soil also and remarked that whatever can be done in constructing a usable trail probably should be done, but there would be "tough" choices to make.

ORV 20-D, USFS, Wenatchee Natl. Forest, Entiat Ranger Dist. - Pond Camp Tie, #1409.1A: Mr. Tveten expressed his concern re the "multi-purpose trail" concept. Even though such trails are for this purpose, they really aren't considered such by the hikers. He asked how many projects are hiking trails and how many trails would be converted to hiking trails. Mr. Lovelady cited the many miles of trails in the National Forest Areas which can be used by hikers and the motorbikes as well. There was general consensus that there is a definite impact on the hikers when ORV users also use the hiking trails. Ms. Marsden also expressed concern about the fact that there appears to be more and more trails being used by the ORV recreationists. Mr. Lovelady replied there are 9,000 miles of total trails in the State of Washington for recreationists and of that total less than 27% are for ORV recreational use. Therefore, in discussing ORV trails, the staff is talking about approximately 2,000 miles. Mr. Tveten pointed out, however, that many off-road vehicles are being used on other trails not identified for their specific use.

Mr. Alexander asked if conflict with other modes of transportation was one of the criteria in reviewing and evaluating the ORV projects. Mr. Lovelady said no, that the staff and ORVAC look at the application from the local level and consider it on its off-road vehicle merits. Project sponsors deal with use conflict issues when determining whether or not a project should be implemented, before sending it to IAC.

At this point, Mr. Wilder read to the Committee the Funding Parameters of the Off-Road Vehicle Program:

- . Move slowly and conservatively with the program - a step at a time. Change as the need develops through evolution not revolution;
- . That guidelines be developed and applied and standards set as data and experience are accumulated;
- . That due process be followed in assessing environmental impacts;
- . That planning be essential to the long-term success of the program;
- . That funding be provided based upon quality of the project and need.
- . That multiple-use be encouraged.

He then suggested that the Committee return to further review of the ORV projects with discussion following the conclusion.

Mr. Tveten stressed his feeling that when ORVAC and staff evaluate the ORV projects they evaluate only as to ORV use and not on the impact of what they do to other recreationists such as hikers.

ORV 29-D, Thurston County Parks - ORV Park Development, Phase 6: Mr. Mackey asked if the IAC staff was satisfied that the difficulties and problems experienced within this project were being taken care of and being resolved. Mr. Lovelady stated the County had made great strides in solving the noise problem and resolving conflicts which had arisen. Mr. Wilder also stated Thurston County was going to be able to meet its obligations in view of the 1984 audit problems. He agreed the \$36,000 was viable for the project.

ORV 18-A, USFS, Wenatchee, Supervisor's Office - Forestwide Log Out: Explanation was given by Mr. Dovel that this project involved removal of fallen trees after the initial maintenance has been done on trails. Tree removal occurs only during the heavy-use season (July, August, September).

ORV 26-A, City of Richland - ORV Park Maintenance and Operation: Mr. Wilder corrected the misunderstanding as to funding of "maintenance" projects. The IAC has traditionally funded maintenance and operation for ORV parks sponsored by local agencies. Local agencies assist where feasible. Mrs. Warden corrected the project resume to indicate that the project would be accomplished from January 1, 1986 to December 31, 1987, rather than 1986.

ORV 28-M, Thurston County Parks - ORV Park Maintenance and Operation: In this instance Mr. Wilder pointed out the park program is funded 100% from Off-Road Vehicle Funds. Mr. Lovelady stated Thurston County had incurred a sizable debt a few years ago and the Committee has allowed the County to pay this off through gate receipts. In response to Mr. Jones' question as to the wording "Rentals - (Vehicle Costs)", Mr. Lovelady stated that the County is not renting the equipment -- that money is placed in the Equipment/Repair Fund.

ORV 39-A, Spokane County Parks Dept. - ORV Park Land Acquisition: Mr. Pinnix asked if providing sand drags was different from the use made in other ORV

parks. Mr. Dovel said this would be unique to the park and the facilities could be used by all ORV users throughout the state.

At the conclusion of the ORV projects presentation, Mr. Tveten reminded the those present that many of these projects are labor-intensive and the Youth Corps Program could be of assistance if called upon.

The Committee recessed at 4:04 and reconvened at 4:11 p.m.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS RECOMMENDATIONS: Staff distributed memorandum dated November 7, 1985, "Off-Road Vehicle Projects - Funding Recommendations", with attached recommended project funding listing. (SEE PAGE 31 STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS).

Mr. Lovelady stated the recommendations were based on information collected from site inspections, personnel interviews, and document reviews. Separate project review and evaluation meetings were conducted with IAC's Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC). Guidelines used in the recommendations were:

1. Allow slow and conservative program evolution.
2. Maintain education and enforcement projects at a high priority.
3. Ensure due process is followed in assessing environmental impacts.
4. Promote planning for the long-term success of the program.

He noted that each development project had undergone an environmental analysis and public hearing. Some planning projects also were subjected to environmental impact review.

Staff recommended that the support level for this year for non-capital projects be 74 percent of the estimated available ORV monies; for capital projects, 26 percent. Of the 33 projects being considered, 30 were recommended for funding.

Mr. Lovelady referred to the list of ORV projects and tabulated columns: "Sponsor Request", "ORVAC Recommendations", and "Staff Recommendations". Staff recommendations were read and reasons for variance. Mr. Lovelady called attention to the 3 projects not being recommended for funding by either ORVAC or staff:

Thurston County Parks 85-8E, Thurston County Parks, ORV Safety-Education Program: Program has not produced results and has alienated many ORV users.

Yakima County Parks 85-31M, ORV Park Maintenance and Operation: Extremely low attendance at this facility. Cost per visitor is getting high. 85-32D, Yakima Co. Park Development also not recommended.

Other projects cited were:

City of Richland, 85-27D, ORV Park Development, Phase 5: Staff and ORVAC recommended a concession not be funded and that the electrical service expansion be reviewed.

Project / Sponsor Name Number	Project Name	Sponsor Request	DRVAC Recommendat.	Staff Recommendat.	Notes
					[A max. of \$40,000 per recommended fte is proposed, as noted below.]
EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS					
2e Pierce Co. Sheriff	DRV Ed/Enf 1	\$205,468	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	new program; 1 fte recommended
3e Richland Police	DRV Ed/Enf 4	36,632	36,630	36,630	
4e Chel/Doug Sheriff	DRV Ed/Enf 7	106,488	80,000	80,000	2 fte; sponsor may allocate both to Chelan.
5e Yakima Co. Sheriff	DRV Ed/Enf 8	49,103	40,000	40,000	submit both Yakima fte's in 1 aplic. in '86.
6e Yakima Co. Sheriff	DRV Ed/Enf 7	55,734	40,000	40,000	
7e Tacoma Metro Parks	DRV Ed/Cor/Admin.1	69,300	52,300	52,300	new prog; del van-trailer; has coord. elemt
8e Thurston Co. Parks	DRV Safety/Educ.7	35,000	- .00	- .00	program has alienated many DRV users
9e Kittitas Co. Sherif	DRV Ed/Enf 8	115,583	80,000	80,000	
10e Grant Co. Sheriff	DRV Ed/Enf 3	94,680	89,700	89,700	2 fte recommended + \$9,700 fence materials
11e Mason Co. Sheriff	DRV Ed/Enf 1	157,610	40,000	40,000	new program; 1 fte recommended
Subtotal =		\$925,598	\$498,630	\$498,630	
PLANNING PROJECTS					
12p USFS Colville S.O.	Forest DRV Study	\$ 8,611	\$ 8,610	\$ 8,610	
14p USFS Colville Npt.	BB Trail Head Plan	5,489	5,480	5,480	
16p USFS Colville Colv	PO Trail Survey	13,900	13,900	13,900	
17p USFS Wenat. Sup Of	Private Lands Surv	26,910	26,910	26,910	
22p USFS Wenat. Cle El	Teaway Trl Survy	9,465	9,460	9,460	work only on trails open to DRVs
25p USFS Wenat. Lvnwth	Beehive Preconst.	7,559	7,550	7,550	
33p Snohomish Co. Pks.	DRV Feasibility St	44,000	44,000	44,000	
34p Ferry Co.	DRV Rec. Area Stdy	7,300	7,300	7,300	
Subtotal =		\$123,234	\$123,210	\$123,210	
CAPITAL PROJECTS					
13e USFS Colville Npt.	Batey-Bould Trail	\$ 28,746	\$ 28,740	\$ 28,740	
15e USFS Colville Colv	Pend-Oreille Trail	40,097	40,090	40,090	
19e USFS Wenat. Entiat	Mad River Trail	93,360	93,360	93,360	
20e USFS Wenat. Entiat	Pond Camp Tie Trl.	39,645	39,640	39,640	
23e USFS Wenat. Cle El	Table Mt. Signs	5,174	5,170	5,170	
24e USFS Wenat. Lvnwth	Miss. Rdp. Tr. Reloc.	6,484	6,480	6,480	
27e City of Richland	DRV Pk. Dev. Ph. 5	108,426	70,400	70,400	del. concession; repl. elect. serv. w/ study
29e Thurston Co. Parks	DRV Pk. Dev. Ph. 6	36,000	36,000	36,000	
32e Yakima Co. Parks	DRV Pk. Dev. Ph.	24,200	- .00	- .00	see 85-31a, below
Subtotal =		\$382,132	\$319,880	\$319,880	
MANAGEMENT PROJECTS					
18a USFS Wenat. Sup Of	Forestwide log out	\$ 4,045	\$ 4,040	\$ 4,040	
26a City of Richland	DRV Pk. M&O	220,225	220,220	220,220	2 year grant
28a Thurston Co. Parks	DRV Pk. M&O	148,000	148,000	148,000	
31e Yakima Co. Parks	DRV Pk. M&O	79,322	- .00	- .00	very low attendance (2500/yr)
30c Yakima Co. Parks	Program Coordinator	21,310	21,310	21,310	
Subtotal =		\$472,902	\$393,570	\$393,570	
LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT					
39a Spokane Co. Parks	DRV Pk. Land Acqui.	\$244,848	\$244,840	\$244,840	proviso: satisfactory operation of all IAC projects.
Subtotal =		\$244,848	\$244,840	\$244,840	

Mr. Lovelady referred to flip-chart graphs in reviewing the Education/Enforcement ORV projects. The graphs denoted an increase in requests for assistance emanating from the various agencies interested in providing ORV education/enforcement programs in their area. Since inception of the program the demand for E&E funds has grown. 240 percent more was being requested at this funding session than the 1984 session. Mr. Lovelady stated it was time to set some reasonable goals, that the ORV fund cannot expect to meet all E & E needs statewide. Staff and ORVAC therefore set a guideline that no applicant for ORV funds would receive more than \$40,000 per employee (FTE).

Mr. Mackey pointed out that ORV 2-E and ORV 11-E (Pierce County and Mason County sheriff departments) were new projects and only \$40,000 was being recommended. He asked if this would cover vehicle expense. Mr. Lovelady replied there would only be minor expenses within that figure for equipment. If the Committee agreed with staff, the sheriffs departments would have to find their own money for vehicles. In response to Mr. Mackey's question, Mr. Dovel stated Pierce County had asked for one full-time coordinator to coordinate the activities of 3.5 deputies. He outlined the regions they would be covering and noted the coordinator would be working with the school system concerning ORV educational programs.

Mr. Tveten asked if the Elbe Hills area had any ORV facilities within it. Terry Graham, Department of Natural Resources, replied it does have limited ORV facilities but none that are maintained by DNR. Mr. Tveten noted that the County is asking for staff to control the area but the ORV activities are "operated" by DNR.

At this point, Mr. Volker brought out the history of the E and E funding program. Other counties have been funded at the beginning of their programs with more than one FTE. The first year of funding should determine how many entities will be in the program. He asked if new agencies applying for funding would now be precluded from their requests. Would there now be funding consideration total allocations statewide versus allocations for numbers of agencies interested in the program? Mr. Wilder said the new applicants would not be precluded, but the staff was recommending they be conservative. Mr. Alexander asked if there were any statutory limitations. Mr. Wilder stated by law the IAC may not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the total ORV funds coming in for E & E. Staff was using standards it had already developed. The ORV funding percentages in the overall program were then discussed.

Land Acquisition Project: IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. WARDEN, SECONDED BY MR. TVETEN, THAT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING OF THE LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT - ORV 39-A, SPOKANE COUNTY PARKS, ORV PARK LAND ACQUISITION, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$244,840 BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WITH THE PROVISIO THERE BE SATISFACTORY OPERATION OF ALL IAC PROJECTS; AND

THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENT WITH SPOKANE COUNTY AND DISBURSE FUNDS FROM THE OUTDOOR RECREATION ACCOUNT UPON EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT CONTRACT BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY AND UPON PERFORMANCE BY THE SPONSORING AGENCY OF THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREIN.

MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED

Dave Veley, Assistant Parks Director, Yakima County Parks, - 85-30C, Yakima ORV Park, Maintenance and Operation: Mr. Veley spoke concerning staff and ORVAC recommendation to close the Yakima County ORV Park. He felt the attendance at the park had not been decreasing, and the park has never realized its potential. Actually there has been a small increase in use over the years the park has been in operation. However, in anticipating the closure of the park, he asked that an additional \$5,000 be added to the funding of the ORV Coordinator (ORV 30-C) making that total \$26,310 rather than \$21,310. This would cover liability insurance costs for fire protection (i.e. boarding up of any windows, security checks, labor, etc.) Mr. Dovei acknowledged staff's support of this request.

ORV Management Projects: IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ALEXANDER, SECONDED BY MRS. WARDEN THAT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING OF THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS - MANAGEMENT - BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE WITH THE ADDITION OF \$5,000 TO THE YAKIMA COUNTY PROJECT (ORV 30-C), ORV COORDINATOR, MAKING THE TOTAL OF THAT PROJECT \$26,310, AND AS LISTED ON PAGE 40 OF THESE MINUTES.

THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND 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 UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

ORV Capital Projects:

Louise Marshall, Washington Trails Association, spoke on behalf of hikers.

- (1) Seem to have a feeling that people keep building new toys, and there is an obligation to provide places for them to be used. Disliked continually making capital projects to take care of these matters.
- (2) Trails over private land were developed informally; landowners did not allow it to happen. Any piece of land that is not fenced in is now open to use by ORVs.
- (3) Urged the IAC to consider steering its staff toward encouraging proposals from the agencies to purchase lands for ORV use rather than use public lands. Felt a better solution for ORV monies use would be to actually acquire lands devoted to that purpose.
- (4) Also suggested there might be less conflicts if Committee and staff would consider placing some non-ORV users on ORVAC. All members on that committee now have the same point of view.

Ira Spring, Citizen, spoke on behalf of hikers.

- (1) There is conflict between ORV recreationists and hikers. Continuing shortage of trails for them to use; are being driven into the more fragile areas of the parks they use.
- (2) Specifically mentioned the Mad River area where there is a high plateau reached by backpackers, but ORV use is driving them away from those areas. ORV money is taking over the trails they use.
- (3) Mentioned the very soft soil in the area, not conducive to ORV use.
- (4) Felt the Committee had not really addressed the needs of the hikers, yet they are many in number throughout the state.

- (5) Hikers have had no input as to where ORV trails are placed. Felt hearings were not announced by Forest Service.
- (6) Asked the Committee to consider placing the ORV money to use in areas where it would not conflict with hikers.

Mr. Pinnix asked which Mad River project Mr. Spring was talking about. There were two projects: ORV 19-D Mad River Trail, and ORV 20-D, Pond Camp Tie Trail. Mr. Spring said both areas are much better for hiking than for ORV use. One trail leads into the other and eventually ends in the fragile meadow area.

Mike Dolfay, USFS, Trails Coordinator, Wenatchee National Forest:

- (1) In 1979 the Forest Service did an intensive Environmental Impact Survey (EIS) on the Wenatchee National Forest's Plan. Realized the conflict between hikers and the trail bikers. Areas of conflict were identified. The Mad River area at that time was considered a low conflict area.
- (2) A multi-purpose trail plan was then set up for the Mad River area.
- (3) Mentioned there was also equestrian use of the area - horse camp leading into the area - used heavily.
- (4) Doubted if hikers used the area in August and September of 1985 because it was closed due to fire hazard.
- (5) Invited the Committee to visit the Wenatchee National Forest area sometime in July or August when the trails are open to see the trails firsthand.

In response to Ms. Cox's questions, Mr. Dolfay said the specific area being discussed involved an 11 mile trail which he felt received little use from hikers except within one mile of the Pine Flat Campground. Mr. Spring clarified the use by hikers stating it was the upper section of the Mad River used by hikers, not the lower section. But, in improving the trails there it will increase ORV use which will go into the hikers' portion of it.

Mr. Dolfay pointed out the Forest Service had sent a plan to the IAC urging reduction in conflicts. The Forest Service feels it is doing that now, and has as much feeling for the environment as hikers.

Mr. Alexander pointed out there had been a review of the projects by ORVAC and staff; a decision made. He suggested in the future these matters ought to be taken care of in the review standards to ensure this type of conflict is covered.

Mr. Pinnix asked that the slides of the projects be shown again. Following the presentation, Ms. Cox suggested the Interagency Committee set aside a separate day to study and review the entire Off-Road Vehicle program and conflicts within it. Mr. Mackey felt the Forest Service should sign the trails and prohibit certain uses on specific trails. Mr. Dolfay said signs are not very useful. They are taken as souvenirs, shot at, and vandalized.

Tom Jesmer, ORV Advisory Committee member - Speaking as a member of the Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Committee (ORVAC), Mr. Jesmer stated:

- (1) The IAC staff and ORVAC had spent many hours in reviewing all of the ORV projects before the Committee.
- (2) Felt right-of-way is an issue of education. If the person is educated, there is not going to be a problem. The one percent who do cause problems

haven't been educated and that is the reason for the E & E ORV Program.

(3) Trails being built for the ORV recreationist are also being built for equestrian use.

(4) Numerous curves are placed in trails to encourage slow ORV speeds and increase safety.

(5) Most of these trails were built in the 1940's -- never engineered but built by people using the areas. Now, it is necessary to make these trails safe for users.

(6) ORV recreationists don't have a problem sharing the trails and get along well with everyone.

(7) Felt Committee had spent a lot of time discussing the ORV issue, and now it was time to approve staff and ORVAC recommendations.

IT WAS MOVED BY MRS. WARDEN, SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER, THAT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUNDING OF THE OFF-ROAD VEHICLE CAPITAL PROJECTS BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE. (SEE PAGE 40 OF THESE MINUTES.)

MR. PINNIX AMENDED THE MOTION - TO DELETE ORV 19-D, USFS WENATCHEE ENTIAT, MAD RIVER TRAIL, AND ORV 20-D, USFS WENATCHEE ENTIAT, POND CAMP TIE TRAIL. SECONDED BY MR. VOLKER.

FIVE MEMBERS VOTED TO APPROVE THIS AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION; FOUR MEMBERS VOTED TO DISAPPROVE IT.

THE AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION WAS PASSED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

Mr. Jones asked for clarification. Mr. Pinnix noted:

(1) People who are not a part of the motorized recreation community should get a chance to participate in reviews and hearings.

(2) Perhaps the staff could re-review these projects as to the conflicts and come back to the Committee later.

(3) The conflicts are not worked out - and this needs to be done.

Mr. Volker stated the Department of Game had had difficulty in the Upper Mad River area also with conflicts between ORV recreationists and wildlife habitat. He also noted that the Director had suggested the Committee move slowly and conservatively with the program. He felt Mr. Spring's comments should be taken into consideration.

It was suggested by Mr. Tveten that the staff set up a meeting with the hikers and Forest Service -- and any others interested in these two projects. The Committee could then have the opportunity to hear the proposals again after that meeting. He felt there had been a lack of communication.

Carol Jensen, Member, ORVAC: Ms. Jensen told of her extreme frustration in the discussions on the projects. She mentioned the many hours ORVAC and staff had put in on reviewing the projects and that the very best projects had been recommended to the Committee. She stated the hikers were represented at the meeting held by ORVAC. It was her opinion the IAC Committee had in its discussions torn apart the recommendations of staff and ORVAC.

Ms. Cox replied the Committee was discussing the issues and would have a workshop strictly devoted to the ORV program so that it could better understand conflicts. Committees exist to assist in these matters and work with all levels of government to reach an accord.

Mr. Tveten asked for clarification - did the Committee accept the recommendations that the staff get together with the various groups and bring these two projects back at the March 1986 IAC meeting? THERE WAS CONSENSUS THAT THIS BE DONE.

QUESTION WAS CALLED FOR ON THE ORIGINAL MOTION AS AMENDED TO FUND THE CAPITAL ORV PROJECTS, AND

THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND 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. (SEE PAGE 40 OF THESE MINUTES.)

MS. WARDEN AND JOE JONES VOTED IN THE NEGATIVE. SEVEN MEMBERS VOTED IN THE AFFIRMATIVE. MOTION CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE.

ORV Planning Projects: The Chair asked for a motion to fund the ORV Planning Projects.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MACKEY, SECONDED BY MS. WARDEN, THAT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR FUNDING OF THE ORV PLANNING PROJECTS BE APPROVED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE (SEE PAGE 40 OF THESE MINUTES), AND

THAT THE DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE'S PROJECT CONTRACT INSTRUMENTS WITH THE LISTED PROJECTS' SPONSORS AND 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 UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Education/Enforcement ORV Projects: The following persons spoke to various projects as noted and discussion was held on certain projects as follows:

Bud Hays, Mason County Sheriff's Department, Undersheriff - Mason County's Project ORV-11-E:

(1) Have three definite areas within the county that are problem areas regarding ORV use. Need two full-time officers and all of the equipment.

(2) Would be able to cut the program back if necessary. Is the first time Mason County has applied for these funds.

(3) Recommend that it be funded at the 1 FTE level, but feel equipment is vital. Other counties when funded received equipment, and the same should apply for this project.

(4) Have had more than 2,500 ORV users in Mason County in one day, and noted that Yakima County Park would be closed due to overall use of that same amount over a period of time.

(5) Tahuya River project is the most heavily used area.

(6) Impossible to get additional funds in the program from the County. County does not have it.

(7) Sheriff of Mason County instructed him to have the Committee take the \$40,000 and give it to some other sheriffs department which could use it. Unable to live with the \$40,000 for the Mason County program.

Questions were asked by the Committee. Mr. Alexander asked the cost to pay and equip one full-time officer. Undersheriff Hays estimated \$40,550 plus \$32,932 equipment - or a total of approximately \$73,592 to get the program "off the ground". Undersheriff Hays said these would be "start up funds".

Sgt. Richard Peterson, Coordinator, E&E Program, Chelan-Douglas Counties, ORV 85-4E:

- (1) Had asked for an addition of one full-time deputy. Need to patrol areas which require these services.
- (2) 2,400 miles of roads require patrolling.
- (3) Are serving needs of Forest Service, Game Dept., DNR, and the Bureau of Land Management. These need to be addressed.
- (4) There is increased use of the deputies now being used in the areas. Spread too thin.
- (5) Mentioned this is a cooperative program between two counties - Chelan and Douglas.
- (6) Commissioners were able to fund \$26,000 additional to assist in the funding of the deputy, Douglas County.
- (7) Douglas County offers unique opportunities for ORV recreationists, yet it has not received any monies of its own for this purpose.
- (8) Federal, state, and private lands are involved and it is a tremendous task.
- (9) Are seeing increase in use of trails by 3 and 4 wheelers.
- (10) Need to split Chelan County into four "districts" instead of the two presently being used - due to increased ORV use.

Mr. Tveten asked if the project received \$80,000, would that be a manageable figure for the County? Sgt. Peterson agreed it would be. The acreage involved included approximately 3,000 square miles. Mr. Tveten pointed out if the funding were not given to Chelan-Douglas Counties, considerable acreage would be closed to the public and not available for public use because it was not being patrolled and overseen by the deputies. It was also pointed out in the discussion that ORV recreationists are getting into many areas where they have not gone before and these areas require patrolling.

John Tontz, Douglas County Commissioner, ORV E & E Project, Chelan-Douglas Counties, ORV 85-4E:

- (1) Stated Douglas County had 1,700 road miles for ORV use.
- (2) The two counties (Chelan-Douglas) have worked closely to operate and administer a good ORV E & E program.
- (3) More and more people are coming to the ORV areas and using them.
- (4) Appreciated the funding in the past and recognize the funding problems at this session of the IAC.

Tom Wauzynski, ORV Deputy, Yakima County E & E Program - ORV 85-5E - ORV 85-6E:

- (1) Is essential to continue ORV program on the lands in Yakima County. Since program has been in existence it has benefited and improved conditions for the ORV recreationists and the citizens of the County.
- (2) Felt amounts requested are necessary to continue the same quality program. Need to continue Public Service Announcements - TV; the safety instruction program; etc.
- (3) Yakima County has contributed equipment for the last three years.

(4) Are experiencing more and more use of these ORV areas in the winter months as well as other months.

(5) If only funded at \$40,000 level, it will cut the program in half with expenses still being incurred. Requested total funding for the program.

Ms. Cox asked if the \$40,000 for each project would be accepted by Yakima County or were they turning it down. Sgt. Wauzynski said it would be accepted but the program would be badly cut.

Earl Williams, Director, Parks and Recreation, Thurston County, Thurston County project ORV 25-28M (ORV Park M & O) & Safety Educ. (ORV 8-E):

(1) Acknowledged concerns expressed last year with the type of program Thurston County had at the park. These have been looked into and corrected, or are in process of being corrected.

(2) Felt the educational program was filling a need in the community. Visits to schools are necessary to discuss ORV safety with small groups.

(3) Articles have been submitted to a number of publications to increase awareness of safety/education program.

(4) This is only area in which Thurston County has been recommended for elimination. Felt it was a necessary program.

(5) Some people have taken exception to certain articles and other items, but felt Thurston County was taking a very good non-enforcement approach to the education program. No deputy is involved.

(6) Difficult for Thurston County if do not receive the funds to continue the Safety Education program.

Mr. Mackey asked what had occurred to alienate many ORV users. Mr. Lovelady reported there had been a number of complaints which is unusual in this type of program. Staff felt that rectifying those complaints was not forthcoming. This was also the second year ORVAC had recommended the program be terminated. Mr. Wilder said there had been problems, staff had wrestled with resolution of those problems, but that had not been satisfactorily resolved. He said he did not want to elaborate at this point. Mr. Mackey suggested this be discussed at the March meeting also. Mr. Alexander asked if the sheriff's office in Thurston County had been approached to do this type of program. CONSENSUS WAS THAT THIS PROJECT BE RETURNED FOR COMMITTEE REVIEW AT THE MARCH 1986 IAC MEETING.

Rich Lago, Off-Road Motorcycle Dealer, Yakima ORV Funding, ORV 85-5E and 85-6E, and 31M - ORV Park:

Mr. Lago had left the meeting prior to opportunity to speak to the Committee.

Tom Young, Sheriff, Kittitas County - ORV 9-E:

(1) Did not take exception to what has been recommended. Now have program and plans which the County is not going to be able to accomplish.

(2) Mentioned the economy of the County - loss of tax revenues.

(3) Kittitas County does not receive funds for ORV permits, yet it has the largest part of the people using ORV facilities. It is number one user area available in the State of Washington.

(4) Crossing of private lands is going to occur. Owners and users have to recognize that problem and measures taken to deal with it.

(5) Felt there are more and more trail conflicts, requiring assistance and effort from deputies.

(6) Developing trails leads to having to patrol them and counties must provide the lead.

(7) Felt need for FTE's was not being considered in the standards for review of the various projects.

(8) Those in the field are better able to judge what is being done in the ORV trail program. Felt it was working very well, but land may be lost because the private owners are getting tired of the type of use their land receives.

(9) Requested that the Committee listen to what all the users are saying; maybe more weight should be given to other problems.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN THAT THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE ORV EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS WITH AN ADDITIONAL \$30,000 EACH BEING GIVEN TO:

<u>ORV 2-E Pierce County Sheriff - ORV Education/Enforcement Program</u>	\$70,000
<u>ORV 11-E Mason County Sheriff - ORV Education/Enforcement Program</u>	70,000

IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THIS ALLOCATION IS FOR THE FIRST YEAR ONLY IN ORDER TO ASSIST THESE TWO COUNTIES WITH THEIR FIRST APPLICATION FOR ASSISTANCE,

AND, FURTHER, THAT THE STAFF PREPARE STANDARDS FOR ORV EDUCATION AND ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE AT THE MARCH 1986 IAC MEETING.

MR. MACKAY SECONDED THE MOTION. (SEE PAGE 40 OF THESE MINUTES.)

Mr. Alexander asked Mr. Jesmer (ORVAC) if allocating the additional \$30,000 for each project would be inconsistent with ORVAC's criteria. Mr. Jesmer replied there is a limit to what the ORV funds can be used for; that the dollars spent for E & E don't add to actual trails or trail miles for the ORV user. There is a need for funding of trails as well. Therefore, ORVAC had recommended lesser amounts for these programs recognizing their need as well as planning, capital, and management projects. ORVAC and staff assume there will be more and more counties asking to participate in the E & E program.

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

IV. A. PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3 - MODIFICATIONS: Mr. Webster referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, "IAC Participation Manual Modifications", and cited the proposed changes necessary to meet appraisal requirements of the National Park Service (NPS). (SEE APPENDIX "C".)

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ALEXANDER, SECONDED BY MS. WARDEN, THAT THE MODIFICATIONS RECOMMENDED BY STAFF AND THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE REQUIREMENTS BE ADOPTED WITHIN IAC PARTICIPATION MANUAL #3 (AQUISITION PROJECTS).

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

IV. D. LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS: Mr. Scott referred to memorandum of staff dated November 7, 1985, "Proposed Legislation - 1986 Session". Since most of the legislation had already been discussed previously, Mr. Scott kept his remarks brief.

- (1) Based on present plans the IAC is not proposing any request legislation during the 1986 Session.
- (2) The IAC will plan an advocacy role with respect to any legislation designed to improve outdoor recreational opportunities in the state.

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE PROJECTS FUNDED AT NOVEMBER 7, 1985

IAC MEETING - OLYMPIA

Funded

EDUCATION/ENFORCEMENT PROJECTS

Pierce County Sheriff Off.	85-2E	\$ 70,000	ORV/Education/Enforcement
Richland Police	85-3E	36,630	" " "
Chelan/Douglas Sheriff Off.	85-4E	80,000	" " "
Yakima Co. Sheriff Office	85-5E	40,000	" " "
Yakima Co. Sheriff Office	85-6E	40,000	" " "
Tacoma Metro. Parks	85-7E	52,300	ORV/Education/Corr/Admin.
Kittitas Co. Sheriff Off.	85-9E	80,000	ORV Education/Enforcement
Grant Co. Sheriff Office	85-10E	89,700	" " "
Mason Co. Sheriff Office	85-11E	70,000	" " "
			\$ 558,630

PLANNING PROJECTS

US Forest Svc. Colville	85-12P	\$ 8,610	Forest ORV Study
US Forest Svc. Newport	85-14P	5,480	Batey/Bould Trail Head Plan
US Forest Svc. Colville	85-16P	13,900	Little Pend Oreille Trail Survey
US Forest Svc. Wenatchee	85-17P	26,910	Private Lands Survey
US Forest Svc. Cle Elum	85-22P	9,460	Teaway Trail Survey
US Forest Svc. Leavenworth	85-25P	7,550	Beehive Reservoir Preconstruction
Snohomish County Parks	85-33P	44,000	ORV Feasibility Study
Ferry County	85-34P	7,300	ORV Recreation Area Study
			\$ 123,210

CAPITAL PROJECTS

US Forest Svc. Newport	85-13D	\$ 28,740	Batey-Bould Trail
US Forest Svc. Colville	85-15D	40,090	Pend-Oreille Trail
US Forest Svc. Wenatchee (Cle Elum)	85-23D	5,170	Table Mountain Signs
US Forest Svc. Wenatchee (Leavenworth)	85-24D	6,480	Mission Ridge Trail Relocation
City of Richland	85-27D	70,400	ORV Park Develop. Phase 5
Thurston Co. Parks	85-29D	36,000	ORV Park Develop. Phase 6
			\$ 186,880

MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

US Forest Svc. Wenatchee	85-18M	\$ 4,040	Forestwide Log Out
City of Richland	85-26M	220,220	ORV Park Maint/Operation
Thurston County Parks	85-28M	148,000	ORV Park Maint/Operation
Yakima County Parks	85-30C	26,310	Program Coordinator
			\$398,570

LAND ACQUISITION PROJECT

Spokane County	85-39A	\$ 244,840	ORV Park Land Acquisition
			\$244,840

TOTAL ORV PROJECTS FUNDING.....\$ 1,512,130

- (3) Propose to advocate legislation included as mentioned earlier -- Initiative 90, General Obligation Bonds (WRPA), and the Property Tax Levy.
- (4) Should certain other legislation be introduced the IAC would be interested in it:
 - . ORV Legislation
 - . Community - School Assistance Program
 - . Urban Parks
- (5) Response to the Governor indicated no formal position has been taken by the Committee on any legislation, and the Governor will have full support of the IAC in terms of his legislative proposals.
- (6) No response received so far from the Office of the Governor or OFM other than one or two calls for clarification.

In response to Mrs. Warden's question, Mr. Scott stated the Camper-Trailer Excise Tax bill had not passed since it would have reduced funding for public education.

IV. E. IAC MEETINGS - 1986: Mr. Wilder suggested the following 1986 meeting dates: March 27-28, July 24-25, November 6-7.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. TVETEN, SECONDED BY MR. MACKKEY, THAT THE FOLLOWING IAC MEETING DATES BE ADOPTED BY THE COMMITTEE FOR THE COMING YEAR:

MARCH 27-28	THURSDAY-FRIDAY	OLYMPIA
JULY 24-25	THURSDAY-FRIDAY	OLYMPIA
NOVEMBER 6-7	THURSDAY-FRIDAY	PLACE TO BE DETERMINED

AND THAT THESE MEETING DATES BE PUBLISHED IN THE WASHINGTON STATE REGISTER IN ACCORDANCE WITH RCW 34.08.

MOTION WAS CARRIED.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' REPORTS: Both Mr. Mackey and Ms. Warden expressed their appreciation to the Committee for their tenure, stating this would be their last meeting. They wished the Committee good luck in the future.

Mr. Pinnix stated this was his first meeting as a designee and he also appreciated staff's work and that of the Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

RATIFIED BY THE COMMITTEE *as corrected at 3/28/1986 IAC meeting*

Anne B. Cox
CHAIR

3/28/1986
DATE